Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park

Section 42 Applicant Response Table

Document reference - EN010162/APP/5.1.11

Revision number 1

June 2025

Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009, APFP Regulation 5(2)(q)

Contents

1 Section 42 Applicant Response Table.....

2 Section 42 Targeted Consultation Applicant Response Table .....

3 Section 42 (Landowner Section 44) Applicant Response Table.....

1 SECTION 42 APPLICANT RESPONSE TABLE

Table 1: Section 42 Applicant Response Table

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The Site Selection has been based on the convenience of being close to the decommissioned power plant of Staythorpe. However, the cumulative impact of the solar array needs to be adequately assessed and justified why this Site has been chosen over other land of lesser quality and how other land has been discounted in accordance with the NPS EN-3, which is clear that Applicants should seek to minimise impact on the best and most versatile agricultural land (defined as land in grades 1, 2 and 3a of the Agricultural Land Classification) and should look to use land and areas of poorer quality.	No	This has all been considered and is assessed and set out in the ES Chapter 17: Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17**] and in terms of site selection Chapter 4: Alternatives **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**. Staythorpe is a convenient and appropriate place to build out renewables, with the proximity of viable and efficient infrastructure to connect to it has many benefits including reduced cost to power consumers and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				an overall reduction in the amount of infrastructure required to be built to accommodate the connection. Note the grid connection statement at **[EN010162/APP/7.15]**.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	If sheep grazing was permitted, it is only likely to be under the panels as other areas outside of the panels are to provide biodiversity enhancements and are not likely to be compatible with grazing. The grass beneath the panels will also likely be of low quality due to the lack of sunlight reaching the ground in these locations due to the nature of the development proposals. The solar panels are likely to be located approximately 0.6m from the ground level at its lowest level, which severely limits the ability for livestock and other associated wildlife to utilise the Site for foraging due to the perimeter fencing.	No	The panel design and height allow for grazing and that is expected to be the principal use under and around the panel areas, where sheep will be able to graze successfully. This is described in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	40 years may be termed 'temporary', but 40 years of the field being out of food production could be longer if an application for repowering and life extension of the solar farm is submitted. No weight should be given to the possibility of grazing as the Site will most likely be lost to agricultural use without any agreements in place to facilitate grazing of the land.	No	The Development lifetime is as described in the Application, and the use for grazing is assessed in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The Agricultural Land Classification report should be informed by soil analysis, and we expect the application to be submitted with a suitable Site Selection report, with the cumulative impact of solar array properly assessed and justified for loss of BMV land.	No	The ALC has been informed by soil analysis as described in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and Appendix TA A17.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.1].** The cumulative effects are assessed in Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** section 17.8.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	It should clearly demonstrate why this Site has been chosen over other land of lesser quality and how other land has been discounted in accordance with the National Policy Statements, which directs development to land and areas of poorer quality.	No	This is addressed in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Much of the land immediately west of North Muskham is high quality arable land being used for production of cereals, potatoes and sugar beet for the local sugar factory and for a significant part of the proposal area, similar crops are grown as well as maize for anaerobic digesters. Much of this is actually classed as Category 2 and it is expected that on a detailed assessment much of the remainder will likely be classed as 3a.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment and assures there will be no permanent loss of agricultural land, only temporary use for the duration of the Development. The Order Limits have decreased since PEIR, taking into account public concerns around use of agricultural land. Additionally, the Applicant approached site selection to avoid higher value land, as set out in the ES Chapter 4,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The documentation does not explain that much of the land proposed, particularly near to North Muskham, will be largely Best and Most Versatile (BMV) and it is suggested that this is addressed more clearly.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
North Muskham Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The report suggests that some sheep grazing under or near solar panels may be included. The report does not however reflect that sheep farming in the UK is in the decline. There is very little evidence to suggest that sheep farming on solar farms is successful and the PC	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Grazing by sheep may be able to take place and is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		believe this is included simply to appear to address the huge loss of farming, particularly on BMV land.		intended, as described in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Sheep need to be kept in open spaces, where the shepherd can easily observe and monitor the flock. Daily inspections are critical for good animal husbandry, so that animals which are injured / lame / ill can be isolated from the herd and treated quickly (sheep are particularly prone to getting cast and dying if not righted within hours). However, within the confines of solar arrays, due to the configuration of the panels, all but near distance views are completely blocked. It would be very difficult for sheepdogs to round up/separate sheep in that situation (quad bikes would be virtually impossible).	No	The panels will be raised off the ground by at least 0.8m. This allows sheep and sheep dogs to see under the panels. For more information, please refer to Chapter 17: Agricultural Land, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Due to the amount of shading from the panels, a healthy sward does not develop; thus, the grass does not provide the necessary amount of sugar and other nutrition that the sheep require for fattening-up. A poor sward can also adversely affect sheep's health.	No	There is no evidence to support this statement. For more information on soil health and quality, please refer to Chapter 17: Agricultural Land, of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	It is contended here that very little (if any) weight should be given to the promise of sheep/continued food production argument. Using BMV cropland for sheep grazing is an inefficient use of that land. It is highly unlikely there are enough sheep locally to populate all the current and planned solar plants and with sheep numbers dropping each year, that gap will become even more pronounced.	No	Noted. The potential for the land under and around the panels to be used for grazing sheep is reviewed and assessed in Chapter 17: Agricultural Land, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**, at section 17.8.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Whilst the parish council is not against renewable energy initiatives in principle these should be balanced with food security needs and impact on the renewable resource location. Whilst the East Midlands comprises 13% of England's farmed area, together with the South East, it has the highest crop output of DEFRA's 8 farming regions in England in a country that is only 60% sufficient in total food production. The use of best most valuable agricultural land (BMV) for solar arrays compromises food security.	No	The assessment of food security and food production is considered in the ES Chapter 17 section 17.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Invariably with DCO or TCPA applications for solar plants, the issue of the loss of BMV land raises its head.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	It is highly regrettable that the results of the ALC testing are not included in the PEIR. Given how long this project has been in the planning, it is difficult to understand why this testing is not complete.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The inevitable consequence of this is to stifle consultation on this important subject area until the ES is published. Understandably, the ExA would normally be reluctant to accept design changes at that stage. The Council's view is that in this particular case, that reluctance should be relaxed with regard to this specific issue.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The provision of BMV likelihood figures is of some assistance. For instance, it is possible to identify several areas where the Applicant seeks to develop on Grade 2 land. Whether these areas will be confirmed as Grade 2 by the Applicant's own soil analysts remains to be seen	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The Applicant does provide some advance notice of their early results	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Certainly in the case of the light blue areas of Figure 5, the Council are aware of views of local farmers that this area is very good agricultural land. It would be of concern if any ALC report bumps this area down to 3b.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The Council have been made aware that at another solar farm project nearby, the land is 'sandland'. It was assessed as a mixture of Grades 3a and3b. What the landowner did not mention to the planning authority was that this land was heavily irrigated to the extent they grew vegetables there, bringing the effective classification to Grades 1 and 2.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988. The availability of irrigation is considered in the ALC.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Some previous solar plant application enquiries and hearings have witnessed a divergence between local people who know the land and the crop history well, and the reported findings of an applicant's paid soil consultants. An example is the Appeal Washford, West Somerset (PINs ref APP/E3335/W/24/3337226). There, the applicant's soil consultants disagreed with	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the actual tenant farmers who farmed the land. It is noted that the GNR soil consultants will also be reporting on soil, farmed for decades by tenant farmers.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	2024 saw a national consultation over proposed changes to the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF). One of the suggested changes was for independent soil consultants to be appointed by, and report to the competent authority. It is regrettable that this was not adopted.	No	The consultation suggestion is aimed at the decision taker, not the Applicant.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Given that one does not have any ALC report to scrutinise, one could be forgiven for thinking that no conclusions on soil grades can be reached at this moment in time. Given that the fields selected for panelling were chosen prior to the ALC results, the Applicants still decided to put panels on fields that the best information at the time suggested would be Grade 2.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Figure 5 of the Technical Appendix A4, correctly identifies this likely Grade 2 land but the Applicant took the view, incorrectly in the view of the Council. that there was a significant difference between Grade 2 and Grade 1 land. It saw Grade 1 land as an area to be avoided whereas Grade 2 was not preferable. This area is not the only area where the Applicant made a conscious decision to select likely Grade 2 land for development.	No	This comment relates to a different site and is not therefore relevant.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The Applicant at paragraph 18 of Chapter 17 downgrades the sensitivity of the highest two grades, thereby putting Grade 1 land on the same footing as Grade 3a. This is not a semantic point.	No	The methodology is fully explained in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Had a fifth sensitivity grade – Very High, been retained as per the IEMA guidelines, then in all likelihood a medium magnitude of change to Grade 2 land would still attract a major significance and a low magnitude would attract a moderate one.	No	A medium magnitude change to Grade 2 is still identified as significant.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	At 3.6.9 of their Scoping Opinion, PINs suggest that the Applicant should consider including mapping sourced from Natural England's new Provisional ALC data as opposed to MAFF historical data. The Council have not found any imagery from the new data. The PEIR does include a figure for Likelihood of BMV land, reliant on the historical MAFF data though it would be fair to say it is not particularly user friendly. It is not known whether the new Natural England's mapping was considered. It does appear there is an absence of any graphics sourced from the new mapping.	No	The imagery being referred to is believed to be a digitised version of the old provisional maps, and hence more accessible but no more reliable than the printed 1:250,000 series ALC maps from which they have been taken.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Of course, impartial provisional ALC mapping will not be the determining factor in considering the significance of the actual loss of BMV land brought about by this development. It will be the results eventually provided by the Applicant's own consultants.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The Natural England and MAFF data serve 2 purposes. The first is to inform developers where the likely BMV land is in order to avoid it where possible. The second is to compare the impartial data to the results of the Applicant's soil surveys to confirm that there are no glaring discrepancies.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	PINs make the point that the new Natural England mapping could differentiate on the split between Grade 3a and 3b land. Unfortunately it does not. The Council made reference earlier in this document to the east and south east of order limits. Figure 7 below is drawn from the Natural England's 2024 mapping for provisional ALC. The light blue areas are indicative of	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Grade 2 land with the green being undifferentiated Grade 3. However there would be a high expectation the green areas immediately surrounding the Grade 2 land would be Grade 3a. The following fields, in the area above and earmarked for panels, are likely to be Grade 2. They are referenced by the field numbers from the PEIR Figure 05.1: Fields numbered 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 20, 21, 206, 207, 208, 230, 278, 280, 281, and 371 plus field 22 is likely to be Grade 3a. 19 fields of likely Grade 2 land.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The above area constitutes the most number of Grade 2 fields lost but other areas are also targeted. Panels on Grade 2 land are planned at Kelham, Weston, a large area east of Eakring and large area west of Maplebeck.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The Council feel that in the ES, this above assertion needs revisiting. The comparison between east and west of the River Trent is correct. However, the last sentence of paragraph 37 requires further scrutiny.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	There is planned panelling on the eastern side of the Grade 2 area east of Eakring and substantial panelling around Maplebeck, a smaller area near Weston, a large part of the Grade 2 area east of Norwell and Bathley and also down at Kelham. Some of the intervening areas are highly likely to be Grade 3a.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The test the Applicant will have to pass is that it was impossible to avoid using BMV land, even if that land was east of the River Trent. There is a difference between 'impossible' and 'not preferred due to the impact on future profits'. That level of evidence is not present in the PEIR. This may have to be done on a field by field basis. The Council is of the view that this may prove an uphill struggle for the Applicant.	No	The relevant policy as set out in the NPS EN-I and EN-3 and the NPPF and Local Plans is set out in Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Field 98 is expected to be Grade 3a and the occupant has photographs of the healthy crops there. He farmed this area for years.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Chapter 17 confirms that sugar beet is grown in fields in the south of the order limits. It is believed at this time there are three main uses for this crop. The obvious one is the nearby sugar factory. But sugar beet is also used for biomass energy production and the production of bioethanol and biogas. Other crops are also used for this. The Council believe that an assessment is required for the loss of all crops (including wheat and maize) due to this development which are, or are likely to be used to create renewable energy.	No	The use of crops and the implications for food production are addressed in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The reason for this is that the Climate Change Committee (CCC) has previously proposed that there needs to be more than 700,000ha of perennial biomass crops by 2050 to help the UK meet its net-zero targets. The CCC has also identified 700,000 hectares of marginal land (Grade 3b to 5) in the UK that could be dedicated to perennial energy crops by	No	The use of crops and the implications for food production are addressed in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		2050. If this development is actually taking land out of bioenergy production and impairing the CCC's objective, that needs to be factored into the net benefits.		
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The Council would wish there to be either an undertaking or a DCO requirement to mandate reported soil chemical checks throughout the project lifetime, to detect any hazardous chemical leachates. This would be to ensure that firstly, there was no contamination that could reach any watercourse, and secondly that the soil would be suitable for an eventual safe return to food production. These checks should be in addition to the hydrochemical checks described at paragraph 51 of Appendix A05.3.	No	The potential for leaching of chemicals from solar panels is considered very low, as reflected by PINS agreement to scope out this aspect from the EIA.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Carlton on Trent Parish Council is concerned about the large areas of land that is currently used for food production, which would be lost to solar.	No	The implications for food production are considered in the ES Chapter 17.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	We ask Elements Green to produce information that demonstrates, and confirm with collected data, that the land being removed from food production is not in the category of Best and Most Versatile.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**] The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	As land agricultural land is lost the wildlife we know and love will disappear	No	The NPS EN-3 comments on agricultural land use are reported in the ES section 17.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17] [EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** covers the significant biodiversity offering the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Solar and Biodiversity Park would bring
Nottinghamshire County Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	For the Egmanton oil well sites adjacent to parcel 7, on the eastern side of the A1, it should be noted that as per the conditions of their permission (planning application reference 3/20/02229/CMM), the well sites can continue extraction until the 31st of December 2025, after which time the sites must be restored	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	It is also noted that the promoter outlines that should any incidental mineral extraction occur on site, the material would be re-used on site for cut and fill with such volumes expected to be small. As per paragraph 5.141 of the Minerals Local Plan, this is acceptable providing the quantities are very small, with the preference for mineral to be re-used as opposed to treated as waste material.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The County Council notes that there is potential to be a significant impact arising from this proposal on agricultural land, soils and agricultural businesses	No	Noted. This topic is considered in Chapter 17 of the ES ALC [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**] Effects on businesses are covered in the ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics [**EN010162/APP/6.2.13**]
Nottinghamshire County Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	We note that surveys of ALC and farm businesses are still underway, and therefore the PEIR does not include completed detailed information on this aspect of the proposal. We would expect that the scheme has potential to be amended further considering the outputs from these surveys prior to submission.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The PEIR notes that from surveys done to date, the majority of land is in grades 3a and 3b with the highest quality land in the northern part of the scheme but does not indicate if this is likely to result in any modification to the proposed scheme.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The PEIR is also not clear at the present time what the impact on stocking and cropping will be, nor on the impact on farm businesses pending completion of current surveys and we therefore remain concerned about these matters.	No	This is now fully reported in the ES in Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	We note the methodology for assessing impacts on soils and land at the different stages of the proposal but defer to Newark and Sherwood District Council who will respond further on this matter.	No	This is now fully reported in the ES in Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**
Forestry Commission	Agricultural Land and Soils	Direct impacts can include, but are not limited to, damaging or compacting soil, damaging functional habitat connections and changing the woodland ecosystem by removing the woodland edge or thinning trees. Indirect impacts can also include increasing the amount of dust, light, air or soil pollution and changing the landscape character of the area.	No	Effects to woodland are assessed in Chapter 8: Ecology and Biodiversity of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** Effects on landscape character are considered in Chapter 7: Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The development removes vast areas of grade 3 agricultural land from food production which is believed to be the best and most versatile (BMV) land. We consider ourselves a forward thinking parish but what we wish to ensure is maintaining the provision of this agricultural land for the future generations of farming and food production. We accept diversity within the	No	This is assessed in the ES Chapter 17.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		farming industry but refuse to let the agricultural classification be lost within this diversification. ie. This land is returned to its original status and classification on the decommissioning of this project.		
Maplebeck Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	More details were requested for the ongoing use of some agricultural areas retained by the developer around the village. A more ecological/ regenerative farming practice would be appreciated plus a village community space.	No	Noted.
Eakring Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	All the fields to be panelled are classified Grade 2 – Very good quality agricultural land ALC (Best and Most Versatile soils) which will be lost to commercial agriculture. In the opinion of Eakring Parish Council solar panels should be placed on rooftops and brownfield sites not high yielding agricultural land.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The fields proposed as part of the development around South Muskham and Little Carlton are graded 3(a), best most versatile land, and by including in the scheme will remove it from vital food production. Areas of poorer quality land have been untouched.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Agricultural Land and Soils	Use of low-pressure construction vehicles with turf tyres or rubber tracks to minimise soil compaction and rutting	No	This is considered in the outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The aspirations of the project include the creation of areas of species-rich grassland within designated ecological mitigation areas. As most of the site is comprised of arable land, soil testing will be required to ensure grassland creation equivalent to 'other neutral grassland' in 'moderate' condition or higher is viable within proposed locations. This will be important to inform establishment strategies, and any remediation required if phosphate and nitrogen indexes are sub-optimal. Grassland creation will also need to take environmental conditions into account and include a variety of mixes that are shade, drought, and water-logging tolerant mixes. For example, increased surface runoff from the solar panels may need to be considered as will impacts from shading. Soil analysis is mentioned under the floodplain meadow section; however, this is during the monitoring stage rather than pre-commencement.	Yes	The oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes details of seed mixes for grassland habitats.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	In respect of Agricultural land classification (Chapter 17), the Applicant's position that agricultural land of a lower quality has been sought is noted, with Appendix 2 presenting the development areas superimposed on the Provisional ALC maps and, seeking to detail how	No	This is reviewed in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land may be impacted by the proposed development. It is noted that this approach is consistent with the National Policy Statement for Renewable Energy Infrastructure (EN-3) which confirms that (paragraph 2.10.29) Applicant's should where possible utilise previously developed land but 'Where the proposed use of any agricultural land has been shown to be necessary, poorer quality land should be preferred to higher quality land avoiding the use of "Best and Most Versatile" agricultural land where possible.'		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Land drainage is a key factor in assessing both land classification and the impact on land restoration particularly along any cable or grid connection route, where trenches are dug, or where soils are stripped even temporarily.	No	This is considered in the outline Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2]**.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	At present there is no settled consensus as to whether a long-term temporary use of land should be considered as not significant and therefore the loss of any BMV over the 20-hectare threshold may still be significant. NSDC note that for planning applications such a loss would require formal consultation with Natural England	No	The methodology suggested by IEMA is followed, as set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Chapter 17 confirms that the site has been appraised for ALC and maps and some details are provided (Appendix 2), but the main information is awaited. At the time of writing (for this chapter) surveyors have undertaken around 90% of the ALC survey.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	It is noted that a Soil Management Plan (SMP) will be provided, stated to minimise the effects on soils and land quality. The SMP will need to identify the soil types across the Site, and any sensitivities to being worked in wet weather. The SMP will provide guidance on the handling of soils, and the trafficking across soils, for all parts of the construction and operational works, and provide guidance for decommissioning. It is noted that an outline SMP will be submitted with the ES. At	No	A full SMP is required to be implemented pursuant to the requirements of the DCO.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		this stage we would seek clarification on how any measures set out in the SMP will be carried forward and implemented at the construction stage.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	In respect of survey methodology for ALC we advise that the soil augering of the site should be undertaken in line with TIN 049 and the MAFF 1988 Guidelines, one auger point per hectare and with occasional soil pits particularly where soil types vary. On a site of this size the amount of augering should be around 2,000+ auger holes and up to 20 pits to verify the soil profiles, increasing if there are significantly different soils.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	NSDC note the Applicant anticipates with that the land impacted by the proposed development will in the region of 50% BMV, perhaps mainly Grade 3a, but not all BMV. We look forward to seeing the final results of the survey work, so that the full impacts of the proposed development can be properly understood in respect of BMV.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**]. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Turning to soil structure this can be significantly damaged during the construction phase of a project such as this. There is a lot of trafficking of vehicles on the land to erect the panels and if this work is undertaken when soils are wet, there can be significant damage. Whilst there may be a means to remedy some damage caused post construction it is possible that long term drainage issues could result, due to the works undertaken during the construction stage.	No	This is considered in Chapter 17 of the ES at section 17.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	It is noted that there are a number of small(er) and largescale Solar PV schemes in both Nottinghamshire and Lincolnshire, with others planned or proposed. Many of these projects will have specific impacts on BMV agricultural land. The area as a whole has substantial amounts of land within the Best and Most Versatile category. There is a potential concern about cumulative impacts on BMV land within the District and would ask that the Applicant capture this specific point within the wider cumulative impact assessment body of work that will be necessary in advancing the EIA work and preparing the ES. Further to the cumulative issues raised above the area of land is considered to be 'large' locally and if the quantities of BMV are as expected or similar the impact could be significant at a District or County Level.	No	This is considered in Chapter 17 of the ES at section 17.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and the cumulative section 17.9.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	At the moment the cable routes have not been surveyed in detail, but once clearly identified this work should be undertaken by the Applicant, notwithstanding that the cable route will be a temporary construction feature with soils reinstated, following burial. The SMP should also consider the cable route in order to minimise the impact on soil structure, land	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		drainage and ultimately soil quality. The route passes across and will be buried under mainly open countryside that is largely arable farmland.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	Two key groups of impacts have been identified elsewhere for the purpose of defining receptor sensitivity and impact magnitude: • Land use and tenure: these are the potential impacts on human activity, including landowners, occupiers, local communities, and other land users. • Agriculture: these are potential impacts on the soil resource, the surrounding environment, and the agricultural productivity of the land.	No	This is considered in Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** of the ES at section 17.6.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	There are additional concerns beyond those identified above to include land drainage impact during construction and restoration of cable trenches, as previously identified above. At other locations, the amount of dust created during construction and settling on crops could be an area of concern and this matter should be considered further, perhaps in the CEMP.	No	This is considered in the oSMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2]** and the CEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	If the land is used for biodiversity, it would not be available for agriculture. However, even if it is available for some form of cutting or grazing it is unlikely that the ALC grade will change significantly during the lifetime of the project. There is evidence that organic matter builds up in biodiversity areas at a faster rate than arable farmland and this may benefit the land, but it is not a factor in the assessment of ALC. Further to this, there is the possibility that where biodiverse land becomes ecologically important, this could be recognised through environmental designations, which limit its return to active agricultural use. At a local, site level, it can prove difficult to establish low fertility grassland on former arable land due to the higher levels of potassium and phosphate in soils.	No	Noted. This benefit is considered in the ES Chapter 17 [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**] at 17.6.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	It is noted that ongoing consultation with Natural England as the appropriate statutory consultee will be undertaken, but NSDC would also seek ongoing dialogue on the topic of ALC, particularly when the survey work is complete and the full extent of impacts on BMV land is properly understood.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Natural England acknowledge our ongoing involvement with regards to soils and the outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) for the proposed cable areas of the development. NE are currently in the process of reviewing the Cable Route oSMP via our Discretionary Advice Service (DAS) and our response to this document will be provided independently to this Section 42 consultation	No	Noted.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Soil is a finite resource which plays an essential role within sustainable ecosystems, performing an array of functions supporting a range of ecosystem services, including storage of carbon, the infiltration and transport of water, nutrient cycling, and provision of food. In order to safeguard soil resources as part of the overall sustainability of the development, it is important that the soil resource are able to retain as many of its important functions as possible. This can be achieved through careful soil management and appropriate, beneficial soil re-use, with consideration on how any adverse impacts on soils can be avoided or minimised. Any actions which compromise options for the future use of the land, or which undermine its inherent capability should be avoided	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Natural England note in Section 17.5.3.1 that a detailed ALC survey of the site is still ongoing and therefore has not been submitted within the PEIR.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**]. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	We note in Section 17.2, Table 17.1 that the cable route is not yet defined and has therefore not been surveyed. A pre-construction methodology is provided in this PEIR, in line with the decision on the Cottam Solar Project (EN10133), whereby it was concluded that this could be considered at a later stage as part of the Soil Management Plan (SMP).	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**]. The assessment has

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Despite the decision made on EN10133, it remains Natural England's advice that that there is a risk of soil damage, ALC degradation and long term or permanent loss of BMV from cable installation without proper soil management practises. Any soil disturbance, including trafficking, risks damaging the soil resource and soil profile, and the agricultural land quality including the potential for degrading agricultural land quality. As such an ALC survey is essential to understand the baseline conditions to firstly avoid BMV agricultural land where possible; then to inform the soil handling practises necessary to minimise potential damage; and provide a baseline soil profile to which the restoration can be compared to demonstrate the land has been appropriately reinstated.	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**]. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Natural England therefore advise that a full ALC survey is required across the full site, including cable route, to inform avoidance, soil management and reinstatement. NE advise these surveys should be undertaken pre-consent, to inform micro-siting & avoidance of the highest quality agricultural land as far as practicable along the cable route, in line with the established principles of the Mitigation Hierarchy (i.e. avoid, then mitigate, then compensate). Some flexibility in the methodology for soil survey along the linear route is likely to be suitable, to best represent the ALC grade of the land along the route	No	The land quality has been assessed by a detailed Agricultural Land Classification (ALC) survey, and the results are set out in the ES Chapter 17 [**EN010162/APP/6.2.17**]. The assessment has been completed in full compliance with the ALC methodology, developed by MAFF and published in 1988.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	We note in Section 17.5.3.1 para 38 that a detailed ALC Survey of the site is still ongoing. Although not complete, the results accounting for about 90% of land surveyed so far indicate that the site is a mixture of mostly Subgrades 3a and 3b. Natural England advise that any permanent loss of 20ha of BMV land must be considered as having a major magnitude within the ES. All BMV land should also be considered as having a	No	The methodology is explained in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and the level of significance is set out.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		high sensitivity, with Grades 1 & 2 being of very high sensitivity.		
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	As it stands, little consideration has been provided in the design to the avoidance of BMV land. NE advise that upon completion of the ALC surveys, further consideration should be given to, and clearly presented in the ES, the avoidance of BMV land, where possible.	Yes	This has formed one of the design considerations.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	NE would always advise that BMV land should be avoided wherever possible for all forms of development, as set out within NPS EN-1 paragraph 5.11.34. In particular, decisions regarding the siting of any permanent elements of the proposals should include careful consideration for the avoidance of BMV, as these are likely to compromise options for the future use of the land and undermine its inherent capability.	Yes	This has formed one of the design considerations.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	Natural England must also advise that habitat creation proposals can lead to permanent/irreversible land use change, where these proposals are intrusive and remove the possibility for land to be returned to agricultural use. Nonetheless, habitat creation on its own will not automatically result in a permanent loss of BMV, and with careful consideration, the long term potential of the land can be retained. For example, a	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		change from arable use to a grazed species rich grassland sward would be unlikely to cause an irreversible land use change, as the soil resource remains in situ and undisturbed; thus could be readily reverted back to BMV. Or, where soils remain undisturbed and water table levels are altered to create certain habitat features, this might easily be controlled by a land manager so the land could be readily reverted back to BMV. This is because ALC grading is based around the long term, inherent properties affecting agricultural capability (climate, site and soil) and versatility, not nutrient levels or having a specific type of cropping or stocking. As such, careful consideration should be given to the siting of any potentially intrusive biodiversity enhancement measures, avoiding BMV land wherever possible.		
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	The ALC data should include a breakdown of the permanent and temporary land take (and the proportion/amount of BMV land) for each element of the development, including Solar PV, mitigation/enhancement areas, retained agricultural land, substations/BESS infrastructure, construction compounds, cable routes and access tracks. This will	No	This is included in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		inform the Planning Inspectorates consideration of the overall impact of the proposal on agricultural land quality and soils. The implications of each element of the proposal on agricultural land quality and soil health may differ; this should be accounted for and addressed within the SMP too.		
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	It is noted in the Non-Technical Summary (section 5.4 para 70) that the operational life of the Development is expected to be 40 years, with decommissioning over a period of 18 to 24 months at the end of the operational phase. Natural England query whether this time limit will be made a requirement of the DCO. The implementation of a defined time limit for the proposed development is necessary to be certain at the time of the application that any proposed land use changes will remain temporary as described, subject always to appropriate soil management.	No	Noted. The DCO contains a decommissioning requirement.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	NE welcome the submission of the outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP) for the proposed cable areas of the development. This is currently under review via a DAS contract with Natural England and our response to this document will be provided independently to this Section 42 consultation response.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	NE welcome the plans to provide a Soil Management Plan (SMP) in order to minimise damage to soils and ensure that any damage is ameliorated. We note in section 17.6 that a final version of the SMP will be prepared and submitted to NSDC pre-construction, based on the outline SMP submitted along with the ES and will be secured by DCO Requirement.	No	Noted. The DCO contains a SMP requirement.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	The detail of this plan is key to safeguarding the soil resource across the development site and must cover the full site boundary, and should incorporate any works that involve soil Page 8 of 9 handling or other activities which may impact the soil (e.g. tracking), including during any 'pre-commencement' activities.	No	Noted.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	NE also advise that a commitment should be made to restore all land temporarily disturbed during construction and operation to be returned to it's current ALC grade. This includes along the cable route & should be informed by the ALC survey.	No	This commitment is made, and the details are set out in the ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** and the Outline Soil Management Plan (oSMP)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2].
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	The SMP should detail the involvement of a suitably qualified soil specialist during the construction, operation and decommissioning phases of the development.	No	This is included in the Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2]**.
Natural England	Agricultural Land and Soils	The SMP should follow DEFRA's Code of practice for the sustainable use of soils on construction sites - GOV.UK.	No	The Soil Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.17.2]** follows DEFRA's code of practice.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council (Appended to NSDC Response)	Agricultural Land and Soils	With over 10% of farmland committed to solar energy, residents fear food security will fall significantly.	No	Chapter 17 of the ES, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** assesses the likely significant effect of the Development on agricultural land. The assessment encompasses the effect on agricultural land as a resource, on soils as a

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				resource, and on land based on rural businesses as an economic activity and for the products they provide in terms of food, non-food produce, and environmental benefits. The Applicant ensures that there will be no permanent loss of agricultural land, only temporary use for the duration of the Development. In addition to this, onsite food production will take place with the Applicants partnership with a local shepherd, ensuring food production will occur via the grazing of sheep.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Cable route	The PEIR states that they could be up to 30m. That may be necessary in some places. Certainly where the intended cables are medium voltage destined for the next substation these will be significant projects.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Cable route	Applicant's staff have stated verbally that many will be 8 -10 metres wide, with presumably narrower trenches within the arrays.	No	132kV cable areas require a working width either side for maintenance purposes, hence the 30m. Cable trenches within the arrays are indeed narrower.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Cable route	It is not known how wide the trench running alongside the Beck in the Figure 18 will be. For the sake of discussion, a width of 10m will be assumed. Depth will be conservatively assumed at 1m below ground level. This is informed by paragraph 68 of Chapter 5 which assumes cabling burial depth of 0.6m to 1.5m. The 3 phase cables will need to rest on top of, and be	No	Cable crossing methodology can be found in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		covered by thermal sand which is required to dissipate heat away. Then the trench will be back filled.		
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Cable route	The stretch of trenching required alongside the Beck here is approximately 254m long. This equates to something in the region of 2,000m3 of soil to be excavated near to the Beck, using heavy plant machinery. The approximate weight of that clay rich soil would be 3,200 tonnes. Added to that groundwork is further excavation.	No	Cable crossing methodology can be found in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**
Environment Agency	Air Quality	Where development involves the use of any non-road going mobile machinery with a net rated power of 37kW and up to 560kW, that is used during site preparation, construction, demolition, and/ or operation, at that site, we strongly recommend that the machinery used shall meet or exceed the latest emissions standards set out in Regulation (EU) 2016/1628 (as amended). This shall apply to the point that the machinery arrives on site, regardless of it being hired or purchased, unless agreed in writing with the Local Planning Authority. Use of low emission technology will improve or maintain air quality and	No	This is required in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), section A5.3.6.1.2, in the ES TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		support LPAs and developers in improving and maintaining local air quality standards and support their net zero objectives. We also advise, the item(s) of machinery must also be registered (where a register is available) for inspection by the appropriate Competent Authority (CA), which is usually the local authority. The Environment Agency can also require this same standard to be applied to sites which it regulates. To avoid dual regulation, at sites that may require an environmental permit this informative should only be applied to the site preparation, construction, and demolition phases. Non-Road Mobile Machinery includes items of plant such as bucket loaders, forklift trucks, excavators, 360 grab, mobile cranes, machine lifts, generators, static pumps, piling rigs etc.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Air Quality	The Air Quality assessment is presented from Paragraph 16.2 onwards. This section of the chapter provides an assessment of predicted vehicle movements using IAQM methodology and scopes out the need for detailed assessment given predicted movement numbers. Emissions from dust and Non-Road Mobile Machinery (NRMM) during construction, operation and	Yes	Further detail on NRMM is provided in the ES Chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues Chapter **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**, section 16.1. NRMM emissions will be limited

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		decommissioning are briefly considered. Maximum numbers of NRMM for construction and decommissioning phases are suggested (no more than 3 in a solar PV area, no more than 5 in a substation or BESS area) however no discussion on what impact this will have on air quality is provided. NSDC would expect consideration of NRMM to include emission levels and the impact this will have on local background levels and potential for nuisance at sensitive receptors, which is currently a missing component of the assessment work undertaken thus far.		by the measures set out in section A5.3.6.1.2. of the oCEMP, TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Air Quality	Outline dust control measures are provided in the Technical Appendix A5.3 Draft Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (Nov 24) section 3.6.5 Dust Suppression and Control. This list of measures in not exhaustive and is missing key elements such as an environmental log to records the daily site checks, weather and actions taken and for this to be made available to NSDC for consideration. NSDC would also expect lead contractor details to be clearly visible at each site entrance for members of the	Yes	The Applicant makes note of this comment. The oCEMP in the ES TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** has been revised to include these measures.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		public and stakeholders, should the need to register or discuss dust or emission complaints arise.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Air Quality	NSDC note that the CEMP is currently in draft format, and it is noted that a dust risk assessment is proposed, however we would expect and request further detail, in line with IAQM and other relevant guidance to be incorporated in future iterations and submissions of the document.	No	The CEMP is in outline stage at submission **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** . Detailed design, including appointing contractors with specific methods, including the times of year that works will be carried out, will be available post-consent and pre-construction, when the final CEMP will be prepared for each phase of the Development. This is the appropriate time to carry out the dust risk assessment and propose specific control measures.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Chapter 6 of Volume 2 comprehensively explains the requirements to move towards net zero and the Council recognises this need.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	At a meeting of our Council on 28th November 2024, senior representatives from the Applicant were asked by a member of the public how they arrived at the 400,000 figure. They were not able to answer but later promised an email reply.	No	The Applicant provided a written response by email on 12th December 2024.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The reply was eventually received stating the figure "is based on annual project generation estimates of 1,125,600MWh" which would be enough for 400,000 homes. To achieve that generation, the Applicant would need to use a capacity factor of 16%. However, on page 3 of the Technical Appendix A15.1, the Applicant assumes "a conservative 10% capacity factor for 40-year operational life".	No	The 10% is a reasonable worst-case assumption for individual panels (i.e., when comparing DC generation with theoretical maximum DC generation (1120 MWp)). However, for the scheme overall, the factor of 16% is correct, when comparing exported electricity (AC) with the theoretical maximum

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				(800 MW (AC)). The number of homes calculation is based on average household electricity consumption figures from OFGEM of 2,700 kWh per annum.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	This and other publications are predicting increased cloud cover. There does appear to be an absence of peer reviewed research which could support an expectation of an increased capacity factor this far north due to climate change. There is published research that predicts an increase in the South West but increases decline as one goes north such that parts of Scotland will see a decrease.	No	The cloud cover predictions outlined within Section 15.3.2.2 are based on the latest UK Climate Projections (UKCP18), using RCP8.5 and the 25 km Grid Cell centred at 487500E 362500N, which is representative of the Order Limits. The data predicts that cloud cover is predicted to reduce by 3.5% by 2078.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The only way that the Applicant's number at 4.7 above can be achieved is by adding a BESS discharge at a time when the arrays are performing at their maximum.	No	This is not correct. The 10% is a reasonable worst-case assumption for individual panels (i.e., when comparing DC generation with theoretical maximum DC generation (1120 MWp)). However, for the scheme overall, the factor of 16% is correct, when comparing exported electricity (AC) with the theoretical maximum (800 MW (AC)).
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Buying power from the National Grid is cheapest at night. The shortage of power generation is during daytime and teatime hours, with the Country having to import electricity from the likes of France and Norway. Some overnight generation passing through this substation is achieved using local wind turbines. Buying this just diverts renewable energy away from the grid, only to put it back later. It does not attract a	No	The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when other

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		carbon avoidance or assist with net zero targets, just financial ones.		sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be charged from the grid when there is excess, cheap electricity

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So, export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The BESS could be recharged from the gas powered Staythorpe Power Station. But again, though this arbitrage might be financially rewarding, it does nothing towards net zero.	No	The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when other sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be charged from the grid when there is excess, cheap electricity available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So, export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Staff working for the Applicant that the two BESS will be able to be recharged from Staythorpe Power Station when overall demand for electricity on the grid is low. This of course will not be 'green' energy.	No	The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when other sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				charged from the grid when there is excess, cheap electricity available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So, export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The BESS avoidance is shown as 3,246,690 teCO2e. This saving cannot be achieved by overnight recharging from the gas powered Staythorpe as there is no figure in the Emissions Produced table above it, covering the burning of gas. And clearly, it would not be renewable energy. It cannot relate to recharging from wind as that greenhouse gas saving is already credited to those wind turbines.	No	The purpose of the BESS is to ensure that excess electricity can be used at times when it is needed. Gas is used to generate electricity only in times of peak demand, when other sources (renewables, nuclear, import from abroad) are insufficient. Electricity from the BESS would be supplied in preference to turning on/up the gas fired

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				power stations, helping keep prices down and minimising climate change effects. The BESS would not draw supply from the grid at times of peak demand (actually the opposite). As well as being charged from excess electricity generated by the Development's solar PV, the BESS would also be charged from the grid when there is excess, cheap electricity available on the grid, i.e., not from gas. So, export from the BESS directly replaces export from gas-fired generation. A correct analysis of the greenhouse gas savings

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				from wind turbines would apply a similar approach to the analysis of savings from the solar PV applied in ES chapter 15, namely that the generation replaces the "grid mix" of electricity sources, not the peak topping-up generation provided from gas. Adding a battery means that the wind (or other) electricity can be stored until periods of peak demand, at which point it is used to avoid having to generate electricity from gas. So, there should be no double-counting.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	It therefore follows if the figures are to be believed, that the energy produced by the arrays is capable of saving 4,176,957teCO2e. But the Applicant has produced greenhouse gas saving figures just for the panels and arrived at 930,266teCO2e.	No	The solar arrays will produce energy when they receive light. This is not necessarily always at peak times, so does not necessarily displace electricity generation from gas fired power stations - the generation from solar displaces grid emissions generally, which are forecast to drop off in the 2030s. The BESS, on the other hand, is assumed always to displace gas generation (at peak times), hence leads to a higher saving.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse	Climate Change and	In Year 4, it states the 800MW solar panels will produce 1,107698MWh in that year. The Council would wish to know how an 800MW array in Nottinghamshire (excluding a BESS top-up) can produce that much	No	The annual energy production is calculated by multiplying the phase capacity by the yield and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council	Energy Need	energy when the Council's own figures suggest annual output would at best be nearer 770,880MWh.		by the annual degradation. For year 4, this includes the following: Phase 3 capacity x yield x assumed annual degradation. 1120 x 1005 x ((1-0.4)*4) = 1,107,698 MWh.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Council estimate of carbon avoidance would be circa 682,560 tonnes over 40 years, not 930,266 tonnes.	No	This is not correct, because the capacity factor used is too low. A 10% factor is a reasonable worst-case assumption for individual panels (i.e., when comparing DC generation with theoretical maximum DC generation (1120 MWp)). However, for the scheme overall, the factor of 16% is correct, when

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				comparing exported electricity (AC) with the theoretical maximum (800 MW (AC)). Solar PV sites typically employ a strategy referred to as 'oversizing,' where more capacity is deployed relative to the grid connection size. This allows the system to more efficiently use the grid capacity available to it, which is often the primary constraint for development. It is beneficial for the Development and beneficial for consumers, who get more energy without higher network

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				investments being required.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Taking year 5, using the Applicant's figures (for now), they predict that that year's PV energy production would be 1,103,267 MWh (which earns a carbon avoidance of 93,778 tonnes). In the same year, they predict to export to the BESS 249,177MWh of which 225,073MWh will be later discharged to the grid, earning another carbon avoidance of 82,151 tonnes. But of course, that is double counting the 225,073MWh. That double counting occurs every year. The BESS is being recharged with electricity that already been credited with carbon avoidance. This was pointed out to the Applicant's staff during face to face consultation and they have now accepted that error.	Yes	This issue was noted during the statutory consultation period and an amended calculation is presented in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The resultant new 40 year total is 702,152 tonnes of carbon avoidance from the panel fields and the BESS avoidance total remains at 3,246,690.	Yes	This issue was noted during the statutory consultation period and an amended calculation is presented in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	This then brings one back to the overestimation of annual MWh generation, given the size of the arrays. The Council maintain that annual MWh production is 800MW times hours in a year multiplied by the capacity factor. So one could expect that by year 3, given the Applicant's figures, the virtually new panels would be all installed and at their most efficient. Whereas the Council would expect the arrays to be producing 770,880MWh per annum, the Applicant predicts 1,112,146MWh. This represents an overestimation of 44 per cent and is unexplained.	No	This is not correct, because the capacity factor used is too low. A 10% factor is a reasonable worst-case assumption for individual panels (i.e., when comparing DC generation with theoretical maximum DC generation (1120 MWp)). However, for the scheme overall, the factor of 16% is correct, when comparing exported electricity (AC) with the theoretical maximum (800 MW (AC)). Solar PV sites typically employ a strategy referred to as 'oversizing,' where more

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				capacity is deployed relative to the grid connection size. This allows the system to more efficiently use the grid capacity available to it, which is often the primary constraint for development. It is beneficial for the Development and beneficial for consumers, who get more energy without higher network investments being required.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Recalculating without the overestimate and adopting a constant rate of overestimation, it is the Council's position that the actual carbon avoidance for the panels direct to the grid is not 930,266 tonnes but 417,904 tonnes.	Yes	An amended calculation is presented in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	This reduces the total net emissions reduction for the 40 years from 1,594,744 to 1,082,382 tonnes. If the Council's calculations are correct, this means that the generating benefits have been overestimated by 47%. This recalculated figure will be even lower given some missing infrastructure from the tables.	Yes	An amended calculation is presented in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Council would welcome any further clarity on the Applicant's figures which assisted them in arriving at their totals.	Yes	In addition to these consultation comment responses, further detail is provided in ES chapter 15 and TA A15.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Following this assessment and the quantification of any resultant lost carbon avoidance, it is believed that the carbon avoidance overall total as shown in Chapter 15 should be adjusted accordingly.	Yes	An amended calculation is presented in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The following helpful explanation (with our emphasis) is drawn from a footnote on page 14 of EN-3:- "10 Case law, beginning with R v Rochdale MBC Ex p. Tew [2000] Env.L.R.1 establishes that while it is not necessary or possible in every case to specify the	No	Yes, this is correct.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		precise details of development, the information contained in the ES should be sufficient to fully assess the project's impact on the environment and establish clearly defined worst case parameters for the assessment. This is sometimes known as 'the Rochdale Envelope." It appears the Applicant has done that in the PEIR with regard to the projected CO2 emissions resulting from steel manufacturing.		
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	In addition to the above infrastructure item, the Applicant lists just under 5,500 tonnes of other infrastructure items to be made of steel. The implication of the CO2 transportation emissions associated with these items implies that some will also be imported from China. It is hoped that this can be clarified in the ES.	No	It has been assumed within ES chapter 15, climate change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, that the Development components, e.g. solar PV modules, PV framework, and BESS cells, will be produced in China and delivered via sea from China, to ensure a worst-case scenario is presented. As outlined within section 15.5, only the PV

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				mounting framework has the potential to be produced in the UK, but the potential emissions savings have not been included in the assessment as the mitigation cannot be committed to at this stage.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Bearing in mind 6.3 above, paragraph 169 in the Technical Appendix A13.2 Employment states:- "The Applicant has also engaged in discussions with TATA steel to discuss potential contract for steel supply for the mounting frames." This has probably been included to hint at a possible reduction in steel transport CO2 emissions.	No	It has been assumed within ES chapter 15, climate change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, that the Development components, e.g. solar PV modules, PV framework, and BESS cells, will be produced in China and delivered via sea from China, to ensure a worst-case scenario is presented.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				As outlined within section 15.5, only the PV mounting framework has the potential to be produced in the UK, but the potential emissions savings have not been included in the assessment as the mitigation cannot be committed to at this stage.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Port Talbot works have not closed completely and it is understood that it will continue to mill steel slabs imported from overseas. It is hoped that the ES can enlighten further on steel sourcing so as to provide firmer assessments on the scale of imports from China and the implications for employment in the United Kingdom. If the imported steel slabs come from China, this could actually increase the transportation CO2 emissions as the steel will have to travel to Wales first before coming to Nottinghamshire.	Yes	It has been assumed within ES chapter 15, climate change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, that the Development components, e.g. solar PV modules, PV framework, and BESS cells, will be produced in China and delivered via sea from China, to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				ensure a worst-case scenario is presented. As outlined within section 15.5, only the PV mounting framework has the potential to be produced in the UK, but the potential emissions savings have not been included in the assessment as the mitigation cannot be committed to at this stage.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Applicant has produced calculations for the CO2 emissions associated with the materials required for this project and the CO2 cost of transporting them. At this early stage of development, the Council accept this is a rough guide only.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse	Climate Change and	The Council would wish there to be clarification in the ES about the specifications for the CCTV and lighting poles. Clearly if these are to be steel or aluminium, there needs to be additional entries in the Production	No	In line with the IEMA Guidelines, activities from the Development that do not significantly

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council	Energy Need	and Materials Transport Emissions tables. If they are to be wooden, there is a greenhouse gas cost to pole production and transporting them to site.		change the result of the assessment have been excluded from the lifecycle GHG evaluation if they are less than 1% of total emissions, and all exclusions are equal to or less than 5% of total emissions. CCTV and lighting poles would be mounted on steel or aluminium poles. The quantities of these materials will be minimal in comparison to the steel/aluminium used elsewhere in the Development, and would be substantially less than the uncertainty in the totals, and therefore does not warrant inclusion.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	There is a similar argument when addressing the issue of deer fencing. This is mentioned in the production emissions. The Applicant sets the fence total length to be 150km. It cites one supplier as an example - Ultimate One Online. Using their product as an example, the Applicant will need at least 1500 of their 100m wire roles. The weight of that steel according to that company would be 163.5 tonnes.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	In the transport emissions table, an incorrect figure of 150 tonnes is provided for Fencing and Gates. Clearly the lowest it can be is 163.5 tonnes but that figure does not include the deer fencing gate frames or other required fencing materials.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	What it also does not include is the 6km of security fencing required for the substations and BESS. The example chosen by the Applicant is using the products from a company called FirstFence. Their example is a 3m length of fence. The Applicant will require 2000 of	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		these units to complete its 6km of fencing plus a similar number of galvanised steel poles. According to that company, the weight of the fencing alone would be 50 tonnes. 2000 poles would weigh circa 13 tonnes.		provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	In table 5.5 of Chapter5, the Applicant confirms that galvanised steel will be used for this security fencing. At the top of page 5 of A15.1, the Applicant has multiplied the 6km of security fencing by the emission factor of 12400kg per kilometre The source is given as Inventory of Carbon and Energy (ICE) Version 3. Their conclusion is that it would lead to 74 tonnes of CO2. The Council only has access to the newer Version 4 of this database. There, the embodied carbon for electro galvanised steel is 2.71 kgCO2e per kilogramme of steel. For the sheet or coil production of the galvanised steel needed for the fencing, the embodied carbon for the 63 tonnes would be 171kgCO2e, not 74. 6.2.6	No	The PEIR document was drafted before the release of ICE V4. This version has been incorporated into ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	But the emissions will be even higher than that as cutting, shaping and welding of the steel will be required before paint is applied. Solvent based paint has a high embodied carbon footprint.	Yes	This has been reviewed and solvent based paint for security fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15].**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Paragraph 60 of Chapter 5 confirms that galvanised steel poles will be used to support the panel frames. However, paragraph 213 of Chapter 9 states the "poles will be made from high-grade aluminium and stainless steel", the latter of which has a higher embodied carbon factor than galvanised. For the purposes of this analysis, galvanised steel will be presumed. On page 3 of Appendix A15.1, the Applicant estimates that 44,800 tonnes of steel will be required for this purpose.	Yes	ES Chapter 9, Water Resources, **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]** has been corrected in this respect.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	ICE V4's embodied carbon figure to create this is 2710kgCO2e per tonne of metal, before additional work such as tube rolling and welding is completed. That would bring the tCO2e emissions for this part of the infrastructure, excluding machining, to 121,408 tonnes of CO2, not 69,440. It is accepted that Chapter	Yes	This comment has been addressed in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		15 states that attempts will be made to use steel sourced from electrical arc-furnaces which will reduce the emissions though these furnaces may not be in the UK.		the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Applicant estimates that 23,520 tonnes of aluminium will be required for the frames. ICE V4 does not produce figures for anodised aluminium or magnelis. V4 does produce figures for aluminium production in China, with a built in use of 31% recycled metal. The embodied carbon factor for China is 14600kgCO2e for every tonne of aluminium, bringing its associated CO2 emissions to 343,392 tonnes as opposed to 156,878.	Yes	This comment has been addressed in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	If however this metal was sourced from Europe, the figures come down dramatically with a European factor of 6670kgCO2e (with a recycling input of 31%). The CO2 emissions would then be 156,878- the same as the Applicant's figure. This firstly confirms the Applicant's methodology of using the ICE headline factors as opposed to the end of life ones. The problem with the lower figure though is that on page 12 of Appendix A15.1 the Applicant puts the journey distance for the aluminium by sea as 19,600km. A voyage distance assessment shows that that distance is consistent with the aluminium travelling from one of the southern ports in China. Certainly not Europe.	Yes	Aluminium has been assumed to be sourced in China, as a worst case, so the embodied carbon for this has been revised for the updated design and ICE v4 figures, taking into account this comment in ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	This represents a significant reduction in the public benefit. If just these 3 CO2 corrections were applied to the Council's adjusted total carbon avoidance figures, then the total shrinks to 843,803 tonnes. Panel sourcing is often not decided predetermination. However as stated above, the Applicant must establish the worst case scenarios for assessment. Sourcing the aluminium from China is the worst case scenario here. One cannot use the European figures for Chinese aluminium.	Yes	Aluminium has been assumed to be sourced in China, as a worst case, so the embodied carbon for this has been revised for the updated design and ICE v4 figures, taking into account this comment in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Following a stage 2 consultation public event, there is now some doubt as to whether aluminium will be used in the framework. If it is not and it is replaced with more UK sourced steel, then that is a substantial CO2 saving. However, until there is documentary evidence over the choice and sourcing of the metals, the aluminium figure has to remain in.	Yes	Aluminium has been assumed to be sourced in China, as a worst case, so the embodied carbon for this has been revised for the updated design and ICE v4 figures, taking into account this comment in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** through an analysis of the data presented in Technical Appendix A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **[EN010162/APP/6.4.15.1]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	There is another infrastructure item that appears not to have made the CO2 calculations. Deer fencing requires deer fencing poles which will no doubt be pile driven into the ground. Paragraph 75 of Appendix A04.1 confirms that the poles will support galvanised wire mesh with the likely pole height of at least circa 2.5m. As previously stated, where exact specifications are not known, then the Applicant should adopt the worst case scenarios. The IEMA Guidelines advising on assessing greenhouse gas emissions allows the exclusion of certain CO2 emitters where their emissions are less than 1% of total emissions. In those instances, it must be clearly stated that that has been done. Certain CO2 production has been excluded in this report and where it has, this is mentioned. The Deer fence poles are not a major contributor but there is no mention of their exclusion.	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Furthermore, they are part of one of the Applicant' sub group's- Fencing and Gates, which requires a full assessment.	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES chapter 15, Climate Change

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Page 7 of Appendix A15.1 attempts to calculate the CO2 emissions for the deer fencing. The Applicant states that the emission factor is 1689.5kg per kilometre to arrive at 253 tonnes. As previously stated, the Council do not have Version 3 of ICE but the newer version 4 (V4). It would be surprising if version 3 gave figures per kilometre as opposed to per tonne. Deer fencing can vary in height. The weight of the deer fencing proposed would be circa 163 tonnes of galvanised steel. The V4 embodied carbon figure to create this is 2710kgCO2e per tonne of metal, resulting in a minimum CO2 emission of 443 tonnes, not 253. This brings the expected CO2 saving down to 843,613 tonnes.	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	As for the wooden poles, the worst case scenario would be for 3m treated wooden poles. For 1.8m high fencing, manufacturers suggest a gap between poles of 3m. For the 150km of predicted deer fencing, this would need 50,000 poles. Weight calculations vary	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES chapter

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		according to pole circumference. A reasonable figure, based on manufacturers' specifications, would be 18kg per 3m pole. The projected weight of the poles would therefore be 900 tonnes.		15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	ICE V4 cannot assist with the CO2 cost with machining these poles. It would not be insignificant. The nearest V4 category is Timber-Closed Panel timber frame system with an embodied carbon coefficient of 0.452kg per kg of wood. This would result in a further 406 tonnes of CO2 in pole manufacture. Clearly, these 900 tonnes of wood had also not been included in the CO2 transport emissions for Fencing and Gates (150 tonnes). The Applicants assign 240km as the mean round trip travel distance for fencing. Adding the 900 tonnes of wood to the 163 tonnes of wire mesh and the 63 tonnes of security fencing results in a minimum transport CO2 cost for fencing of 65 tonnes, not 9.	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The sub-total at 6.2.13 can now be reduced further following the conclusions at 6.20-6.21, resulting in a new sub-total of 843,151 tonnes of carbon avoidance.	Yes	This has been reviewed, and deer fencing has now been considered within the analysis provided in ES chapter

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Applicant uses a CO2 factor of 1550kg per tonne of steel, supposedly drawn from ICE V3. ICE V4 does not include this figure for any steel grade. Steel containers are either made of corten steel, galvanised steel or a mixture of both. The most appropriate ICE category appears to be organic coated steel sheets which attracts an emission factor of 2.88kg CO2 per kilogramme of steel, meaning the containers produce 230 tonnes of CO2 as opposed to the Applicant's 124 tonnes.	Yes	The CO2 factor for steel was sourced from the ICE V3.0 'Steel, Section', with a factor of 1.55 kg/CO2e. This has been updated to 'finished cold-rolled coil steel', as the best estimate of kg CO2e from the ICE database, with an emissions factor of 2.57 kg/CO2e.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	As for the substation construction, it is not known what grade steel is intended. The assumption is made that it will need to be coated. Taking the worst case scenario, the same grade as above will be adopted. This means that the 2800 tonnes of substation construction steel would cause 8064 tonnes of CO2. This brings the	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		running total down to 839,321 tonnes of CO2 avoided. The same miscalculation has been made with the BESS storage containers. It assumes each container will be capable of storing 4MWh and therefore 220 of them will be required.		chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Applicant states that containers will have heat exchangers but it very unclear where the production emissions for these 371 pieces of the infrastructure have been included.	Yes	The heat exchangers are an in-built section of the BESS, and are considered within its embodied carbon calculation.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The illustrative design parameters (Table 5.9 Chapter 5) put the number of BESS storage containers as 371. Adopting this figure and the applicant's assumption that each container will weigh 2 tonnes, then that is a total of 742 tonnes of steel which will either be corten steel, galvanised steel or a mixture of both. Applying the same emissions factor as above from V4 for their manufacture, that provides an estimate of 2137 tonnes of CO2 as opposed to 682 from the Applicant.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	There is a further miscalculation with regard to the transportation emissions for the substations. On page 14 in table A15.1, the total weight of all the substations is given as 2.8 tonnes. However, one is told on page 6 that 2800 tonnes of steel are required for these builds. The associated emissions are therefore not 0.1 tonnes of CO2 but 162 tonnes, according to ICE V4.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	there is an adjustment needed for the CO2 embodied in the replacement panel supports. The Applicant's figures are shown at Table A15.1.2.6 in TA A15.1. The Applicant totals the combined steel and aluminium panel support production emissions at 226,318 tonnes whereas that figure has now been shown that it would be 464,800 tonnes if the correct V4 emission factor is used.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Applicant then provides too high a figure for the original framework transportation emissions in this table, the correct one being 178,014, not 182,161. Adjusting the combined production emissions figure	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and using the correct transport figure brings about a net increase of 23,433 tonnes of CO2.		provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Transformers have been included in the steel total. It is recognised that these pieces of equipment contain other materials, some of which would attract a higher emissions factor.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Transformer production emissions are based by the Applicant on 510 tonnes of steel. When it comes to transporting them, 1020 tonnes of transformers travel by sea but then only 500 leave the port for the site. It is not intended to correct this error as it is not known which of the 3 figures is right.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	For the purposes of decommissioning, the lower figure will be used. This totals 46,434 tonnes of steel and using the Applicant's emission factor, it would attract 46 tonnes of decommissioning CO2 emissions The decommissioning transportation CO2 impact would no longer be 184 tonnes but 2228. Total steel decommissioning would then be 2274 tonnes of CO2.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Production omissions are included for 255 tonnes of oil for the transformers. This oil does not appear in the transportation CO2 calculations.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The weight figures for the transformers are confusing and It is not clear whether the oil is included in any of the figures. If it not, then calculated separately for a distance of 150km, this would cause a further 9 tonnes of CO2 emissions.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Transformer oil does not appear in the decommissioning calculations either. Clearly, this material will be disposed of in a different way to the transformer metals.	Yes	The oil type used within the transformers is not yet confirmed, but mineral oil has been presented as a worst case within ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Staff working for the Applicant have however helpfully verbally confirmed at a public consultation that it will most likely use mineral oil. Mineral oil is not listed separately in ICE V4. However, all the liquid refined hydrocarbon fuels that it does list have an emissions factor around 3 tonnes of CO_2 per tonne of oil refined.	Yes	The oil type used within the transformers is not yet confirmed, but mineral oil has been presented as a worst case within ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The verbal confirmation that mineral oil will be relied upon. This oil a distillate obtained during fuel refinement and distillates have an associated emissions factor of 3.226 tonnes of CO2 per tonne, leading to a total of 823 tCO2e.	Yes	The oil type used within the transformers is not yet confirmed, but mineral oil has been presented as a worst case within ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Applicant states that on page 8 of A15.1 that the construction compounds will need 36,000 tonnes of aggregate. The decommissioning phase assumes a removal of the same amount.	No	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The transport to site shows 40,050 tonnes. This is assumed to be the total weight of the aggregate for the construction compounds plus the 4050 tonnes of grit for the access tracks.	No	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Council feel that the total aggregate needs to be reviewed. It will not just be required for the construction compounds and access tracks. However, it is possible that the compound access tracks have been included in 1125 tonnes of aggregate required for each compound.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Presumably though more aggregate will be required as a base for the new asphalt substation roads. And it might be considered prudent to include the asphalt and road building embodied carbon.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	For some reason, the 239 tonnes of copper and 900 tonnes of wood have not been included. However, the related CO2 decommissioning emissions for these two materials are also not large enough to be hugely significant. The same applies to the CO2 linked to the stakes for 50,000 trees/shrubs and tree guards.	Yes	This has been reviewed, with wood from fencing and copper now considered within the analysis provided in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Deer fencing poles are assumed to be wooden, as is typical.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	With the guards likely to be made from HDPE and the stakes softwood, the probable total CO2 emissions linked to these items is under 100 tonnes. And of course there is a carbon capture element for the trees.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**. Forestry is a renewable business (i.e. new trees will be grown in place of the felled ones - and in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				any scenario the felled ones would ultimately have died and decomposed somehow, and been replaced by new trees), and so the relevant carbon associated with the wood is only the carbon for working, treating and transporting it.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Not all the errors are damaging to the carbon avoidance figures. In Table A15.1.2.7, page 25 of Appendix A15.1 the Applicant states the mass of the batteries to be decommissioned is 1,760,000 tonnes. This obviously is incorrect. The actual weight would be 38,218, including the replacement batteries. This error is repeated on page 27.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The decommissioning of the batteries is reduced to 813 tonnes (not 37477) and decommissioning transportation CO2 is reduced to 1834 tonnes (not 84,480). This is the largest miscalculation and changes the carbon avoidance up to 931495 tonnes.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	There is another positive error in that recycling the aggregate has been counted twice – in operational waste and decommissioning waste. The correction leads to an increase in carbon avoidance of 468 tCO2e.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The decommissioning of the deer fence poles is not included but this was to be expected as they did not appear in any of the other calculations. Disposal should be achievable within a 50km radius so a mean round trip distance should be 100km. The conversion	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		closed loop factor for wood is 6.41061kgCO2e per tonne. Assuming they would not be going to landfill, this results in an emission total of 6 tonnes with a transport CO2 emission total of 21 tonnes.		provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Page 18 of the Appendix A15.1 introduces a figure for waste transport of 2,002,800 tonnes.km with a 50km average transporting distance. This means the Applicant is estimating 40,056 tonnes of waste. Therefore this waste tonnage is virtually all aggregate along with 5 tonnes of wood.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Chapter 16 also assumes no wasted copper, or tin for the cabling when it is cut to length. This is also contradicted in the same paragraph 144. Virtually all the 40,056 tonnes seem to consist of recycled aggregate (page 16). However, on page 39 of Chapter 16, the Applicant confirms they are expecting waste in paper, cardboard, wood, packaging, metals, chemicals, fuels, oil and welfare facility waste.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised commentary is provided in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** Section 16.7, of Chapter 16, Waste

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.2.16] has been updated to reflect the latest estimates of waste arising from the Development during the construction and operation phases.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Given that arriving at accurate waste estimates is not reliable, the CO2 cost relating to 180 tonnes of worker related waste is likely to be less than 50 tonnes of CO2.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Council believe that more detail is required in the ES. This will probably have to be a worst case assessment as opposed to no assessment, as in the PEIR.	Yes	These approach to carbon associated with waste has been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Applicant states they intend to install 417 tonnes of cabling which will require removal upon decommissioning. However, the cabling does not figure in that data set. That said, the decommissioning CO2 costs for the cabling only comes to 22 tCO2e	No	These approach to carbon associated with waste has been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The final transportation emissions relate to those on the Chinese mainland. Such emissions are classed as Scope 3 emissions in the UK Government's GHG Conversion Factors. The most likely source of the panels is the Xinjiang province and this was confirmed by staff working for the Applicant on 31st January 2025.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	It will be assumed that the southern Chinese port of Shenzhen is the main destination on the mainland and that the overwhelming majority of the journey from the chosen sample town of Turpan (part of the Chinese rail freight northern network, close to Xinjiang) will be by rail. An HGV delivery mileage of the panel containers to the rail freight depot from Xinjiang is estimated as 300km. Using Chinese rail infrastructure mapping, the rail distance is estimated at 3,700km. Transporting 64,442 tonnes (110% of 58584 tonnes) of panels on this journey would cause 4638 tCO2e for HGV emissions and 6,626 tonnes for rail freight (using the GHG 2024 Conversion factors). This totals 11,264 tonnes of CO2. This is a conservative figure as the HGV distances are likely to be much higher.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised commentary is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The final material not included in the Applicant's estimates is thermal sand. This will be required to encase the underground cables, in order to dissipate the heat more efficiently. The Applicant has helpfully provided their calculations for total cable distance - 15km of 33kV, 30km of 132kV cabling and 1km of 400kV cabling.	No	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised analysis is provided in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Applicant states that trenches can be as wide as 30m. However, the Applicant's staff have been spoken to and they have stated that 8m to 10m would be the most common for the 3 phase medium voltage runs. Trenching in the array compounds will be less wide but staff have explained that some higher voltage trenches could easily be 15-20m wide. For calculations, a conservative average trench width of 5m will be used for 33kv cabling, 10m for the 132kv and 8m for the 400kv. If more details are provided about trench width, then this issue will be revisited.	No	ES Chapter 5, Development Description, **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** provides further detail on expected widths of cable trenches.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	For every metre length of sand encased cabling, the assumption will be made that 0.4m3 of sand by volume will be required. This provides a rough total volume of sand required as circa 15,000m3, weighing 240,000 tonnes	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised commentary is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	This appears to be the first mention of waterproof ducting as a construction material. It does not appear in the emissions tables. There is no mention of how many kilometres of it are needed or its relationship with the thermal sand. It is assumed that it will be some form of plastic which will have a significant embodied carbon factor. But without more information, it is impossible to factor in this material. Clearly more information is required.	Yes	The embodied carbon associated with the plastic included in the cables is considered in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The embodied carbon for that sand will be 1792 tonnes. Using the same transportation distance the Applicant adopted for aggregate, that equates to 24,000,000 tonnes.km which has a carbon emissions factor of 5,760 tonnes of CO2. It should be quite easy for the Applicant to come up with a different figure as they have all the technical specifications. However, our rough calculations would not have been necessary had the Applicant included thermal sand and ducting in their calculations from the outset.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised commentary is provided in the ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Methane is the second most important greenhouse gas contributor to climate change following carbon dioxide. In fact, methane's ability to trap heat in the atmosphere is stronger than that of carbon dioxide. Nitrous Oxide is the third greenhouse gas measurable using the aforementioned conversion factors. The presentation of their impact is by showing the CO2 equivalence. The UK Government's GHG Conversion factors require companies to report emissions for all the three gasses.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	By mass, CO2 is by far the most significant harmful emission. However, the burning of fossil fuels in transportation also releases methane (CH4) and nitrous oxide (N2O) which are both greenhouse gasses.	Yes	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The Council have completed a series of calculations for the on-site fuel consuming machinery and the transportation elements of this development. Using the aforementioned conversion factors, it has been possible to total the consumption in tonnes of petrol, diesel and marine diesel. From there, the total CO2 equivalent emissions of CH4 and N2O can be calculated. The final total is 6673 tonnes of CO2 equivalence.	Yes	Fuel consumption for plant, machinery, and generators is assessed for construction and decommissioning within TA A15.1: Lifecycle Greenhouse Gas Evaluation **(EN010162/APP/6.4.15.**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				1). The emissions factor in kg of CO2e represents all emissions including CH4 and N20.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The combined effects of the revision of CO2 avoidance through aggregate power generation, and this review of the CO2 emissions that are a consequence of deploying the materials required for the development, is that the recalculated projected carbon avoidance over 40 years is 905,762 tonnes, not 1,594,744. This represents a 76% over-inflation of the benefits. Appendix C shows that all the recalculations correct wrong conversion factors, omitted infrastructure or incorrect data, or mathematical errors - not exclusions following the 1% IEMA guidelines.	No	Noted. Amendments to the analysis have been made in response to consultation comments as well as to changes to the design parameters, as set out in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	No CO2 emissions resulting from painting, machining, factory welding, pressure treating the 50,000 wooden poles, cable ducting, metal fastenings and the use of chemicals for the wood have been included.	No	Noted. Amendments to the analysis have been made in response to consultation comments as well as to changes to the design parameters, as set out in ES chapter

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	There is also a large Scope 3 CO2 emission caused by the freight depot and container port handling machinery, and the quay cranes loading and unloading the shipping containers in port.	No	Noted. Amendments to the analysis have been made in response to consultation comments as well as to changes to the design parameters, as set out in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	The focus of the assessment is on the damage to the fronts of panels from sharp projectiles. It concludes that there would be negligible impact on water bodies and therefore a negligible significance of effect. It is surprising to learn from Appendix A15.1 that the Applicant expects 90% of the panels to last the full 40 years. The Council would wish there to be an evidence based affirmation of this assumption.	No	There are no panels of current designs that are yet 40 years old, so there is no evidence base for the assumption. It is made on the basis that the life expectancy is 40 years, but that not all panels will achieve that. There is a range of possible causes of a panel not lasting its

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				expected lifetime, with physical damage being one of them.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	An asserted national advantage is its contribution to energy security for the UK.	No	This is correct.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Internationally, the Applicant predicts a positive impact on climate change (section 15.4 of Chapter 15) which is an international benefit.	No	Updated predictions are made in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**
National Fire Chiefs Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	Grid scale Battery Energy Storage Systems (BESS) are a fundamental part of the UK's move toward a sustainable energy system.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	We would like to stress we are open to renewable and sustainable energy.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	In respect of Climate change, we note that under the heading Assessment of Potential Effects Paragraph 15.4 presents a summary of emissions produced by the proposed development, alongside the emission savings, measured in 'Tonnes of Carbon Dioxide Equivalent' (tCO2e).	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Climate Change and Energy Need	NSDC welcome the benefits to be achieved by the proposed development, which would bring about predicted net emissions saved of – 1,594,744 (tCO2e).Whilst it is noted that the assessment assumes a worst-case scenario in the (for example, importation of steel for the PV frames from China) notwithstanding the net emissions saved, there is still a substantial amount of emissions predicted to be produced by the proposed development at a figure of 2,623,573 (tCO2e). NSDC would encourage the Applicant to consider how emission types generated (across the construction, operation, and	No	Opportunities to reduce the emissions generated by the Development will be undertaken where practicable, for example, manufacturing sheet steel into the mounting structures within Work no. 1, powered by renewable energy generated **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		decommissioning phases) could be reduced from the 'worst case scenario' currently presented.		Other energy conservation measures such as switching off engines of trucks while they are waiting to access the site or unloading have already been considered and are secured within the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** .The worst case scenario presented is to ensure that all potential impacts of the Development are assessed accordingly.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Climate Change and	It is noted at Paragraph 15.5 (Mitigation Measures and Residual Effects) that the Applicant is considering various measures to further reduce possible carbon emissions. This includes sourcing steel for the solar PV	No	It has been assumed within ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	Energy Need	mounting structures UK based suppliers, including those that use electrical arc furnaces rather than fossil fuel fired furnaces, amongst other potential measures. Such possible measures are welcomed, but details of how the Applicant would commit to and deliver such additional measures are required, including how they would be secured as part of the DCO.		that the Development components, e.g. solar PV modules, PV framework, and BESS cells, will be produced in China and delivered via sea from China, to ensure a worst-case scenario is presented. As outlined within section 15.1, only the PV mounting framework has the potential to be produced in the UK, but the potential emissions savings have not been included in the assessment as the mitigation cannot be committed to at this stage.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
North Muskham Parish Council	Community benefits	The villages forming part of that are near to the GNR and would be hosting a project for much wider benefit across the county and beyond. There is much discussion on the benefit of solar energy and the potenQal for managing energy costs. There is not however any mention of providing a direct benefit to the host communities. Reduced energy bills for instance would seem a logical approach given the huge changes and disruption that local communities will endure. The PC ask that EG address this in their proposal.	No	Noted.
North Muskham Parish Council	Community benefits	The proposal documents refer at length to the benefits of solar power but do not address the adverse impact caused by the construction materials. The PC ask that assurance are given that materials such as solar panels and associated equipment will not 1) transported thousands of miles to the UK, 2) Be produced using nonrenewable energy.	No	It has been assumed within ES Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**, that the Development components, e.g. solar PV modules, PV framework, and BESS cells, will be produced in China and delivered via sea from China, to ensure a worst-case

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				scenario is presented. As outlined within section 15.5, only the PV mounting framework has the potential to be produced in the UK, but the potential emissions savings have not been included in the assessment as the mitigation cannot be committed to at this stage.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Community benefits	The Council would be very interested to learn from the ES how many members of the public, by the time of its publication, had indicated a willingness to assist in the planting. Or whether any local research has been completed to gauge support.	No	The Applicant undertook local research and decided to engage Sherwood Forest Trust (SFT) to see how a local organisation would want to shape the tree planting aspect of the proposal. SFT then stated a desire for native

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				species planting and that their volunteers could plant the trees at their nurseries.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Community benefits	Such benefits could then include energy security and a tiny contribution to reducing climate change worldwide.	No	The Community engagement for GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park has been extensive across the pre-application stage of the Development. Benefits to local communities include: • The NG+ package offers £1m per annum in Community Benefit across the 40-year life of the Development. • The extensive new access to the countryside through

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				32km of permissive routes. • Biodiversity Net Gain of 60% for habitats, 26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses, with the Development creating 64,500 new trees and over 1,000acres of ecological enhancement area. • The innovative EG Academy programme which has helped 113 local students gain renewable qualifications. • The substantial business rates the Development will pay to the local councils

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				to improve local services. • The meaningful and well-paid job creation both in construction and permanent roles.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Community benefits	The Applicant might be tempted to mention NG+ - a community benefit scheme, set up and funded by the Applicant.	No	The NG+ scheme has been set up and shall be funded by the Development, it will benefit from an independent oversight board and be managed by a charity, the Nottingham Community Fund (NCF)
Nottinghamshire County Council	Community benefits	It is recognised that community benefits are outside of the planning balance and therefore have no weight in the decision making process.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Community benefits	The Council welcomes the proposed community benefit package, referred to as NG+, which has the potential to make available around £1 million per annum to support local initiatives.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Community benefits	The principle of renewable energy saving solutions for local residents and businesses is supported, including grants for energy-efficient upgrades, as is the proposal to fund pre-existing flood prevention schemes and various recreational projects.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Community benefits	Further consideration should be given to the preferences and aspirations of the local communities through this consultation exercise and during the project lifetime.	No	The NG+ fund's measures have so far been created in liaison with local residents and guided by their thoughts and aspirations.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Community benefits	Further information should be provided with respect to the proposed governance arrangements for managing and distributing this funding post consent.	No	The NG+ scheme has been set up and shall be funded by the Development, it will benefit from an independent oversight board and be managed by a charity, the Nottingham Community Fund (NCF)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Community benefits	The level of information currently available is fairly limited and the council would like to understand in more detail how NG+ would operate in practice and what legal arrangements will be established to secure its delivery for the full extent of the consent order. It is suggested that this level of detail is made available within the public domain prior to submission.	No	The NG+ scheme has been set up and shall be funded by the Development, it will benefit from an independent oversight board and be managed by a charity, the Nottingham Community Fund (NCF)
Weston Parish Council	Community benefits	Weston has little financial support for the few remaining amenities in the village. The village hall and All Saints Church have significant needs for improvements, both need toilets and the church the fitting cost of new bells. The parish clock also needs a service and any repairs following being stood for over two years. Can funding be ring fenced for the community to pay for or contribute towards these in compensation and mitigation of the impact thew works and installations will have on us.	No	Weston has been supported by the NG+ fund via a grant to improve local facilities, as have many communities since the early stage set up of NG+

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Community benefits	As a parish if we had some form of grant or funding which we could draw down on to ensure regular maintenance especially during the build stage it would be beneficial.	No	This is noted and NG+ have and will continue to reach out to Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton to discuss further.
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	Community benefits	In all the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA), Health Impact Assessment (HIA) SCOPE reports we have found no mention of the cumulative physical and mental impact this development and others will have on the human population.	No	Developments to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment are identified in ES chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]** TA A2.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** . The cumulative effects of these developments are then assessed in the respective ES chapters, including for human health in section 16.4 of ES chapter 16,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	Community benefits	There is potential for multiple solar parks to be under construction at the same time or at least be overlapping. This could have a disastrous effect on road safety, traffic delays and of course the wellbeing of our communities. The alternative to multiple developments taking place at the same time is of course that they occur sequentially with an undetermined gap. This means the local communities are affected adversely, not by the developers optimistically stated timeframes, but for several years. Will this be considered and taken fully into account?	No	Traffic and transport cumulative effects during construction are based on worst case scenarios are detailed in ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**
Eakring Parish Council	Community benefits	The construction phase will result in an increase in noise and vibration pollution associated with the movement of vehicles, heavy machinery etc. which is unacceptable for both residents and wildlife. Eakring supports a number of successful businesses	No	The assessment of noise and vibration is undertaken in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]** and concludes that the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				impact of noise and vibration is predicted to be Negligible to Minor Adverse and are therefore not significant.
North Muskham Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	Large solar installations would detract from the natural beauty and historical heritage that make our district unique.	No	Potential effects on the settings of heritage assets and on buried archaeology are assessed in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** which also sets out how mitigation of those effects may achieve.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Cultural heritage	Field 5 and 13 should be removed as there will be an adverse impact on the approaches to several significant heritage assets.	No	As detailed in Chapter 11: Cultural Heritage and Archaeology, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** geophysical surveys and trenching evaluation were carried out on a

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				wider area than the Order Limits as set out in this ES, as a result of the Order Limits reducing through the design iterations. The full surveys are included in this ES Chapter and its TAs, as this contributes to the rationale for the design changes and provides context for archaeology in the local area. Where fields are referred to that are no longer in the Order Limits, these are identified in italics in the text. Where fields remain within the Order Limits they are shown in bold. Where fields are listed as within areas but are

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				not referred to in the text, no substantial finds were identified. Please refer to this Chapter and relevant Technical Appendices for more information.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Cultural heritage	Field 577 and 153 should be removed because of the effect on single/narrow track approaches to several significant heritage assets	No	Field 577 is allocated to Work Area 3 Mitigation and Field 153 to Work Area 1 Solar Arrays. The effects on the setting of North Park Farmhouse are assessed at section 11.8.2.2 of Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Cultural heritage	Given the Historic England guidance that great care should be taken to ensure heritage assets are conserved in a manner appropriate to their significance, including the impact of proposals on views important to their setting it is felt that the solar	No	The effects on the setting of Moorhouse Chapel are assessed at section 11.8.2.2 of Chapter 11, Cultural

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		arrays in Fields 13, 5, and 577, 153 in the circulated plan, should be removed as they affect the approaches and vistas from the Grade II* listed Moorhouse Chapel.		Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**. The effects were not considered significant in EIA terms.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Cultural heritage	The proximity of arrays of the proposed density will have an adverse visual and environmental impact on the immediate vicinity and the rural character of the historic village of Laxton and its unique open field system as recognised by section 23 Administration of Justice Act 1977 and a parliamentary undertaking.	No	The impact on the setting of heritage assets including Laxton conservation area will be assessed in the ES. and mitigation proposed if necessary.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Cultural heritage	Visitors to our region are drawn by the varied selection of historical assets ranging in size and demonstrating the effect of different historical eras on our community.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	It is the County Council's position that the applicant must provide sufficient desk-based research, non-intrusive survey and intrusive field evaluation to adequately assess the archaeological potential and the developmental impacts of the proposed scheme. This must then feed into an appropriate post-consent Archaeological Mitigation Strategy (AMS) to reduce the	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		impact of the development to a minimum on archaeological remains and other cultural heritage sites.		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The scheme runs through areas of known archaeological potential dating from the Neolithic to postmedieval period and all archaeological periods in between are represented on the Nottinghamshire Historic Environment Record (NHER).	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	From experience of past schemes, it is certain that currently unknown archaeological sites will also be identified through a robust programme of evaluation and assessment work.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The potential impact to the archaeological resource from development work is considered significant and adverse and will result in total or partial loss when archaeological remains are encountered.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The applicant's approach to cultural heritage to date, has been broadly agreeable and we welcome the level of engagement so far.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	A desk-based assessment has been produced and provides a sound assessment of the known archaeological potential.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Two phases of geophysics (magnetometry) have been undertaken with the second phase due to be completed shortly.	No	The second phase of geophysics has been completed and the resulting report included as TA A11.5 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.5]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Two phases of trial trench evaluation have also been commissioned, with the first completed in 2024 and the second currently under way.	No	The second phase of trenching has been completed and the resulting report included as TA A11.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.7]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The approach to desk-based assessment and non-intrusive survey are agreeable and provide a sound baseline for further investigative work.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The approach to evaluation trenching is a cause for concern primarily due to the limited scope of investigation.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The applicant's approach to evaluation trenching has been to target areas of archaeological potential identified solely through the desk-based and non-intrusive methodologies, which have known limitations for successfully identifying some archaeological sites within the County	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The current approach introduces significant confirmation bias within their data set where significant archaeological sites will be missed through a lack of evaluation trenching in areas where the previous assessment techniques have not been successful in identifying archaeological remains.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Evaluation trenching is both an informative and prospection technique and is currently not being employed adequately for the latter by the applicant.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The Council recommends that the full order limits should be subject to trial trench evaluation with a minimum 3% coverage where geophysics has been undertaken and 5% coverage where it has not. Any less would be insufficient to properly inform the EIA assessment and for the production of a fully informed AMS.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	11.1.1.2 Operation – This scheme will require mid-life refits at least once. The removal of old infrastructure and installation of new will have significant ground impacts.		This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Section 11.8.2.1 does acknowledge this but fails to acknowledge that any mitigation measures can only be assessed through appropriate evaluation at this stage of assessment. Evaluation during operation will not be possible.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Decommissioning is likely to have significant ground impacts beyond that of construction.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Areas of archaeological potential must also be assessed at this stage for such impacts as it will not be possible post consent.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	11.5.1 (49) – we agree that the current approach to evaluation will result in 'some cases where the potential presence of heritage assets or their significance remains difficult to state with confidence'. This can be addressed largely through sufficient evaluation.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	11.5.5 – We welcome the acknowledgement of the limitations and uncertainties outlined in this section.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	We would highlight advice on the Rochdale Envelope and its guiding NSIP Advice Note Nine	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	11.7 While we welcome suggestions for design mitigation, this is not yet agreeable until the archaeological resource has been properly characterised and specific details are provided for the mitigation techniques presented. For instance, preservation of remains in situ would normally require an ongoing commitment for monitoring during the operational life of the scheme.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	11.8 – We broadly agree with the 'assessment of likely effects' section, although we would challenge some of the 'pre-mitigation significance of effect' assessments in tables 11.6 to 11.12.	No	The Council's position is noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	However, the main cause for concern are the large areas of the site where this assessment is impossible to undertake in the absence of sufficient evaluation trenching.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	11.9 Mitigation Measures – this section presents an outline for mitigation techniques. These techniques are all appropriate but will require sufficient evaluation to deploy them effectively.	No	The Council's position is noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Greater detail for each technique will need to be included in the AMS, and where necessary in the CEMP, OEMP and DEMP as the applicant has suggested.	No	Greater detail provided in the AMS (TA A11.8 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.8]**) and other documents cited.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Archaeology is considered at Schedule 2, Requirement 11. The wording is currently insufficient to ensure the protection of archaeological remains and does not make provision for any phases of evaluation work that might be required post-consent and any necessary updates to the AMS that might also be required	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The PEIR has presented a good initial assessment of the known archaeological potential.	No	The Council's position is noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The evidential baseline of archaeological information is currently limited, but additional work is underway which is welcomed.	No	The Council's position is noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The proposed limitation for evaluation trenching is concerning and the DCO application must include the results of a full programme of trial trench evaluation to properly inform the post-consent AMS.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	Trenching results presented at the assessment stage are essential for effective risk management and to inform programme scheduling and budget management. Failing to do so could lead to unnecessary destruction of heritage assets, potential programme delays or deliverability issues and excessive cost increases that could otherwise be avoided.	No	The Council's position is noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Cultural heritage	The provision of sufficient baseline information to identify and assess the impact on known and potential heritage assets is required by Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 (Regulation 5 (2d)), National Planning Statement Policy EN1 (Section 5.8), and the National Planning Policy Framework.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	Broadly speaking we support the approach taken by the applicant towards the historic environment. We note that mitigation measures are presented and we recommend that all proposed mitigation measures are secured through an appropriate mechanism; the key document would be a suitable worded requirement within the Development Consent Order	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		(DCO) supported by Outline WSI and Code of Construction Practice (CoCP) documents.		
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	Please note that also we recommend further archaeological evaluation is undertaken in addition to that carried out under Phase 1 prior to the submission of the full Environmental Statement and with enough detail to inform the DCO application, particularly in areas where there is a high archaeological potential. Conservation Areas of Caunton, Maplebeck and Kelham are identified as at least partly within the solar park site. A further 17 Conservation Areas along with 222 listed buildings (of which 19 are listed at Grade I), 27 Scheduled Monuments and one Registered Park and Garden are identifed within 2 km of the solar park site. A further 18 Grade I Listed Buildings, 27 Grade II* Listed Buildings, 29 Scheduled Monuments, one Registered Park and Garden and one Historic Battlefield are identified between 2 km and 5 km from the site. We ask that where these have been considered as part of the scoping excercise, these are given robust and careful assessment in relation to their settings as part of the Environmental Statement, including views to and from these assets	No	An Interim Report on the Phase 2 evaluation results is included as TA A11.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.7]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	We note that it is stated that the main beneficial effects include the removal of areas of sensitive archaeological remains from ploughing and an increased understanding of the significance of archaeological remains and historic buildings as a result of investigations. Which leads to the assertion that mitigation in the form of preservation in situ or preservation by record will reduce these significant effects to levels which are not significant in EIA terms. However, while this statement may be relevant, we note that this assessment does not reflect in NPPF terms.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	We appreciate the statement that it will not be possible to fully assess all potential effects until the design is finalised and baseline studies are completed, and strongly encourage that where designated heritage assets, of both archaeological and built nature are potentially affect, we are engaged further in the development of the detailed design as well as in the development of additional mitigation to be incorporated into the final design and the Heritage Mitigation Strategy and Outline Written Scheme of Investigation.	No	This point is addressed in Table 11.1 in ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Historic England	Cultural Heritage	We note and support the assertion that potential adverse effects have been minimised by designing the development to avoid, as far as possible, the most sensitive archaeological remains, such as sites of former settlements. We also welcome engagement regarding proposed screening which aims to reduce the effect of changes in the settings of buildings, monuments and designed landscapes, while recognising that as the design develops additional measures will be required.	No	Historic England's position is noted.
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	A large percentage of Averham and Kelham fall within a Conservation Area.	No	The potential effects of the Development on Averham and Kelham are assessed in ES chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** and supporting appendices.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Eakring Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	Eakring is a conservation village and has a significant amount of historic interest associated with it. The Church of St Andrew is Grade II*, while there are four Grade II domestic properties in the village including Eakring Windmill. The medieval "three field system" of strip farming was practiced in Eakring until WW II This "Open Field "system of farming is still easily identifiable	No	The potential effects of the Development on Eakring are assessed in ES chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** and supporting appendices.
Eakring Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	on the boundary of Field DB015, within the order limits – "below ground subrectangular enclosure" . Fish Ponds above ground feature close proximity to Field DB016. Terraced area above ground feature within village. Enclosure at Eakring below ground feature within Field DB013. Ridge and Furrow, Banks and Features at Mansey Common above ground features. Ridge and furrow, banks and other features at Dukes Wood above ground features.	No	The potential effects of the Development on Eakring are assessed in ES chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** and supporting appendices.
South Muskham and Little Carlton	Cultural Heritage	The fields that lie between South Muskham, Little Carlton and Bathley are rich in heritage as they contain monuments that relate to the extensive history of our communities.	Yes	These potential effects of the Development are assessed in ES chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council				**[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]** and supporting appendices. The PV fields at South Muskham, Little Carlton and Bathley have been removed from the Development.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Cultural Heritage	Little Carlton was originally a medieval village and part of the meadow field system, and there is evidence of two medieval ponds, one of which still holds water and borders one of the medieval field enclosures. While the areas of Little Carlton used during the Middle Ages are now only earthworks or buried remains including sunken gulleys, some rectangular earthworks remain (some of which are believed to be footprints of houses). The fields where this evidence remains are included on the maps (Ref DB062 GNR PEIR Masterplan) as being filled with solar panels. This cannot happen, these fields hold vital evidence that relates to the history of our community and should be sacrosanct and protected from any development. They	No	Field DB062 has been removed from the Order Limits.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		should be removed from the masterplan. Turning this area into a semi-industrialised area will cause immeasurable harm to our history which dates back to the Domesday Book.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	Interpretation Boards are referred to as Embedded Enhanced Measures contributing to Cultural Heritage however as set out in the referenced Appendices, Cultural Heritage is about the existing associations and the how they contribute to the value of the landscape within the study area not about how they are relayed to the public.	No	Information boards are seen as part of the 'conserve and enhance' aspect of heritage, will a negligible beneficial effect as assessed in ES chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	In respect of archaeology, NSDC have agreed that NCC will provide a direct response on this part of the chapter. Accordingly, our comments in respect of this chapter are limited to matters of built heritage and conservation only as detailed below. NSDC have received the PEIR documents and acknowledge the methodology outline used in the document PEIR Volume 2 Chapter 11 – Cultural Heritage and Archaeology, section 11.5. In respect of the	No	Noted regarding response being limited to built heritage and conservation matters only.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		methodology, we make the following specific comments below.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	NSDC acknowledge that there is a large number of heritage assets that fall within the scoping exercise as set out in document PEIR Volume 4 Technical Appendix A11.2: Setting Assessment Scoping Exercise. Having reviewed the document NSDC agree with the heritage assets that have been scoped in, however, there are a few assets that have been scoped out that either require further justification as to why they have been scoped out or they should be scoped in. Many have the rationale that 'Whilst the setting of the assets is considered to extend to the OL this element of the setting is not considered to contribute to the architectural and historic interests of the asset.' Further assessment with robust reasoning and justification is needed in order to set out how the setting does not contribute. Once impacts are fully understood, we would wish to see alongside these detailed proposals for mitigation of any potential harm caused by the proposals	No	Setting Assessment Scoping exercise to be reviewed and amended as necessary. Assets may be taken forward to ES chapter if appropriate. The concern is noted and the specific assets noted below have been reviewed and where appropriate the assessment at TA A11.2, Heritage Settings Assessment Scoping **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	The conservation team have identified the following assets in particular that would require further assessment: Moorhouse Chapel (1045631). Church Farmhouse (1045632).Park Lidget (1045962). Beesthorpe Hall, Stable and parkland (1045977 and 1045978) Edgefield House Hotel and Boundary Wall (1369986).Coach house and wall at Edgefield House Hotel (1045947)	Yes	These assets have been reviewed and where appropriate the assessment presented in TA11.2, Heritage Settings Assessment Scoping **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]** has been amended. As a result of the review Moorhouse Chapel has been included in the assessment presented at section 11.8.2.2 in the ES Chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	NSDC have concerns with the assessments where all heritage assets are grouped within conservation areas, regardless of the individual grade of the asset. Those that are Grade I and II* are considered to be of 'high' heritage significance compared to conservation areas	Yes	Higher grade assets have been reviewed and the assessment presented in TA A11.2 Heritage Settings

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and grade II listed buildings being of 'medium' heritage significance. The higher-grade assets should be individually assessed.		Assessments Scoping **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]** has been amended.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	NSDC also note that some of the heritage assets have been scoped out but fall within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility for BESS and Substations (Figure 7.8 BESS and 400kV Substation ZTV Study – Including Screening).NSDC agree that the following heritage assets have the potential to be impacted by the BESS and Substations and would either require further assessment to provide robust justification for scoping out or they should be scoped in: The Manor House (1370184).Church of Holy Trinity (1045559).Upton Conservation Area. Averham Conservation Area. Church of St Michael (1046008)	Yes	These assets have been reviewed and where appropriate the assessment presented in TA A11.2 Heritage Settings Assessment Scoping **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]** has been amended.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	However, as presented by the Landscape and Visual comments (VPC), we would recommend a viewpoint along the A616 which would include the Grade II Beesthorpe Hall and Attached Cottage (1045977) and Grade II Stables at Beesthorpe (1045978). This is because the Listed Buildings form part of an unregistered park and garden and the experience of	Yes	VP51 has been added in response to this comment

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		accessing the road to these buildings has the potential to be impacted.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	In addition, we would recommend that View 44 (Figure7.11 Visualisations –Viewpoints 1-49) is either reconsidered and expanded, or that an additional viewpoint is added. This is to encompass more of Staythorpe, notably the Grade II The Manor House (1370184), which is situated near to three houses located off of Pingley Close that have been identified as Non-Designated Heritage Assets(NDHAs) as a result of their association with architect Thomas Howitt. The Manor House is also located within the Zone of Theoretical Visibility (in Figure 7.1 Solar Areas ZTV Study – Including Screening) and has the potential to be impacted by the proposals.	Yes	Figure 11.5, Heritage Viewpoints **[EN010162/APP/6.3.11.5]** has been added in response to this comment.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Cultural Heritage	Designed landscapes form an integral part of the heritage of Newark and Sherwood. There are a number of unregistered parks and gardens within the District that are potentially impacted by the proposals such as Averham Park and Winkburn Park. It is anticipated that work will need to be undertaken to examine these against the Council's Criteria for identifying NDHAs. Landscapes shaped by human	No	Averham Park and Winkburn Park are discussed in TA A11.1, Archaeological Desk-Based Assessment - Part 3 of 3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.1]** . Winkburn Park is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		activity which are not on the national register but are identified locally as having a degree of significance because of their heritage interest, are likely to be regarded as NDHAs. These identified landscapes merit consideration in planning decisions. The majority of the unregistered parks and gardens in the District are identified on the Nottinghamshire historic environment record (HER), administered by Nottinghamshire County Council. The types of sites identified by us include:• public parks• formal gardens• archaeological landscapes• landscaped private parks and gardens.• municipal cemeteries The identification of new unregistered parks and gardens is carried out using the definition informed by Historic England's registered park & garden selection guides. These state that an unregistered park and garden should comprise: 'Landscapes shaped by human activity which are not on the national register but are identified locally as having a degree of significance meriting consideration in planning decisions, because of their heritage interest.' Further information is contained within our adopted NDHA Criteria document16.		assessed in TA A 11.2, Heritage Settings Assessment Scoping **[EN010162/APP/6.4.11.2]**. Averham Park House has been included in the fuller assessment in Section 11.8.2.2 of the ES chapter 11, Cultural Heritage and Archaeology **[EN010162/APP/6.2.11]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	Once all the wildlife and biodiversity sites are established, it is unclear what will happen to these areas. The fact that weight is given to the temporary nature, although 40 years is half of a person's lifetime, significant weight is given to the creation of habitats and resting of the BMV land.	No	The wildlife and biodiversity areas will be managed and maintained during the operational phase of the Development, as set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (ES TA A A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**). At decommissioning, these areas may be retained or may be removed. This decision will be made shortly before decommissioning in consultation with Newark and Sherwood District Council, as part of the Decommissioning and Restoration Plan

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				(DRP) (ES TA A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**).
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	As technology advances, so does the lifetime of the solar arrays. NPPF 2024, Paragraph 166 (c) even states that "in the case of applications for the repowering and life-extension of existing renewable sites, give significant weight to the benefits of utilising an established site". It seems unlikely that the Site will ever return to agricultural use and will be a permanent structure for many years far greater than the 40-year period stated.	No	The application, and the Development Consent Order, if granted by the Secretary of State, will permit the Development to be constructed, operate for up to 40 years, and will then have to be decommissioned. It is correct that technology and the needs of society evolve over time. If, at a later point in time, it is seen by the Development owners, the landowners and decision makers (following due consultation with the public and other bodies

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				as appropriate) as being appropriate to apply for and grant an additional consent, then perhaps the Development won't be decommissioned, or will be replaced by something else. The current application does not seek to restrict future decisions.
North Muskham Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	The proposal includes new planting of hedges and trees to provide screening across the site. It is generally accepted that some of this may fail or be destroyed during the process. Plans for the maintenance should be addressed for the duration of the project.	No	The wildlife and biodiversity areas will be managed and maintained during the operational phase of the Development, as set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (ES TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
North Muskham Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	The PC ask that as well as the new planting proposed, consideration is given to the repair and maintenance of currently existing hedgerows that form part of the screening of the site/s.	No	Hedgerows within the Order Limits will be improved and maintained as part of the mitigation and enhancement proposals, as set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (LEMP) (ES TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).
North Muskham Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	The PC ask that consideration is given to a likely increase in fly-tipping. This already happens across the district and the reduction/elimination of farm traffic and workers will only encourage this further. Plans need to be incorporated and budget associated for this highly likely increase.	No	Where access to off-road areas is required as part of the Development, this will be secured by gates (with keys for those who need them for access). If there is any change to off-road access for activities such as fly-tipping resulting

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				from the Development, it will be a decrease in such access.
North Muskham Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	If issues occur around hedging, screening, damage, fly-tipping etc, the PC would like to know that they can speak to a named individual for resolution. It is suggested that a hotline be available during the construction and operation of the development.	No	The Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (ES TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and the Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (OEMP) (ES TA A5.5 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]**) include provision for a public point of contact with a representative of the Development.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	There is some doubt that the planned electric arc furnaces at Port Talbot or Teesside will be operational by the time of the start of the construction phase. However, the Applicant's framework manufacturing	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		sub-contractor does believe that Port Talbot will be operational. Time will tell.		
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	Consequences of damage to short term generation capacity of the project, the reduced revenue and the repair costs for the owner, then they are not significant impacts for the environment.	No	The Development will be designed such that it can withstand storms predicted in future climate scenarios, by modelling the wind uplift force on the panels and ensuring that the mounting poles are driven in until they can resist such force (using a push-pull test).
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	Whether a requirement could be attached that operations are not allowed to commence until the right amount of mitigation planting has been completed is a matter for the ExA. This seems unlikely as it seems that the development will go operational in phases.	No	The oLEMP Outline Landscape and Ecology Masterplan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** provides for the timing of landscape mitigation. A final LEMP must be approved prior to the commencement of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				development, pursuant to a requirement.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Construction and decommissioning	We are concerned at the process for decommissioning. No evidence has been produced of the bond that the developer has stated is in place for that process and returning the field to their existing use.	No	An outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) is provided in the ES TA A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.]**
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Construction and decommissioning	Section 8.6.2 states that the exact start date of construction within the year of commencement is to be confirmed, but the large extent and phasing of the Development provides flexibility to carry out otherwise potentially harmful activities at less sensitive times. For example, if a seasonal constraint is identified, such as a nesting bird, it may be possible to postpone activities programmed for a certain location or time. The phasing of construction over a period of 24 months will also reduce the overall magnitude and extent of effects arising from several otherwise concurrent operations. We are supportive of that approach	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Construction and decommissioning	Details should be provided on how these sites will be protected during the construction and decommissioning stages of this proposal	No	Details of protection of species during construction and decommissioning phases are found in the ES TA A5.3 the outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** and at ES TA A5.6 the Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Construction and decommissioning	Decommissioning works are likely to be similar in character to those described during construction and subject to similar environmental controls. However, the extent and value of habitats will have increased over the operational period. It is possible that some of the created and enhanced habitats will be retained at the end of the operational period, but it is likely that most habitats in Works No. 1–3 will be returned to their	No	An outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan is included as ES Technical Appendix A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]** . This sets out that the majority of decisions

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		former condition. Work Nos. 4–8 may be retained and so there would be no additional change in habitats associated with them. The loss of habitats that have increased in value during the operational period would represent low to high (depending on habitat) adverse effects on features of Local to County value. It would be disappointing for habitats to be lost after 40 years of establishment and the land returned to the current baseline albeit with some areas of higher value habitat types retained. We would expect that the decommissioning phase, and its potential ecological effects, will be assessed and appropriately mitigated in line with the prevailing guidance and policies of the time.		about what will be decommissioned and how it will be done will be decided shortly prior to the decommissioning, ensuring it is carried out in line with policies and guidance prevailing at that time.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Construction and decommissioning	As part of the Assessment Scenarios and Potential Effects (7.1.5) for clarity diversions to, stopping up and the introduction permissive routes should be set out in the bullet points of effects during construction on the landscape and again in 7.1.7 dusting operation.	No	Please find details on dusting in the Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) [EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Construction and decommissioning	Decommissioning is addressed within the assessment of each ecological receptor. According to Chapter 5 (Development Description) of the PEIR, this may include removal of some of the substations, all the permissive paths, solar panels, underground cables, potential reversion of the grassland beneath the solar panels to arable and potentially the access tracks. It is assumed that any landscape structure planting, including trees and hedgerows created to meet biodiversity and enhancement obligations, would remain in place during decommissioning. However, it is unclear if this would also apply to the specified green corridors and wildlife sites shown on the Masterplan. This needs to be clarified within the proposed Decommissioning Restoration Plan (DRP), and we welcome further dialogue on this matter. This would be particularly important for any habitats adjacent to existing Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) that may also meet selection criteria and warrant inclusion within the LWS boundary or form its own LWS designation.	No	An outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) is provided as ES TA A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]** . It is expected that this will be developed into a full DRP shortly prior to decommissioning, in consultation with various organisations and submitted for the approval of the planning authority. It should be noted, however, that even if certain aspects of the Development are agreed to be left in situ, there would be no requirement for the landowners to be bound by these decisions, and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				they could change them (subject to regulations at that time).
Natural England	Construction and decommissioning	NE welcome the consideration of decommissioning impacts upon the SSSI as discussed in Section 8.8.4.3 of the PEIR. We concur with the assessment that impacts arising during decommissioning are likely to be similar to those identified during the construction period. NE advise that the DEMP (Decommissioning Environmental Management Plan) should address the potential impact pathways of the decommissioning phase of the proposed development on the SSSI.	No	An outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan is included in Technical Appendix A5.6 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]** .
Natural England	Construction and decommissioning	It is noted in the Non-Technical Summary (section 5.4 para 70) that the operational life of the Development is expected to be 40 years, with decommissioning over a period of 18 to 24 months at the end of the operational phase. Natural England query whether this time limit will be made a requirement of the DCO. The implementation of a defined time limit for the proposed development is necessary to be certain at the time of the application that any proposed land use changes	No	An outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) is provided as ES TA A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]** .. It is expected that this will be developed into a full DRP shortly prior to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		will remain temporary as described, subject always to appropriate soil management.		decommissioning, in consultation with various organisations and submitted for the approval of the planning authority. It should be noted, however, that even if certain aspects of the Development are agreed to be left in situ, there would be no requirement for the landowners to be bound by these decisions, and they could change them (subject to regulations at that time).
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Application Site comprises 2,900 hectares of agricultural land. Whilst it is acknowledged that the solar PV area of the development is approximately 1,372 hectares, with the remaining area designated for enhancement, cables and access, only 323 hectares are to be denoted for biodiversity enhancements. This	No	The Development design has been revised in response to many factors and has resulted in the Order Limits being reduced to 1,766 ha and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		equates to approximately 11.13% of the total Site and is somewhat disappointing given the name change to include 'Biodiversity Park' in the development description.		the Solar PV area reduced to 1,025 ha. The area of land allocated to mitigation/enhancement is 556 ha which comprises a greater proportion (31 %) of the Order Limits than the PEIR design.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The series of open areas proposed for enhancements must be coherent and planned to optimise any benefit to the wildlife. Management of these areas needs to be secured during the life of the development but it is not understood what happens to these areas once the Site is decommissioned. Once established, the loss of the sites would once again have a greater impact on the wildlife and should be safeguarded in perpetuity.	No	The Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) describes how the Development will be managed to benefit wildlife. The oLEMP has been developed in partnership and consultation with a range

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				of stakeholders to help it maximise benefits to wildlife. The implementation of the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** will be secured as a requirement of the DCO. Decommissioning effects are fully assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	If the proposal is to be described as a 'Biodiversity Park', the biodiversity enhancements on the Site should go further than using a total of 11.13% of the Site. The existing wildlife will be displaced and habitats removed during the construction phase. The areas denoted for biodiversity should be implemented at the earliest stage of the construction if granted.	No	The proportion of the Order Limits allocated to mitigation/enhancement is 31 % which is higher than the PEIR design. The 1,025 ha of Solar PV areas also provides benefits to wildlife.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
North Muskham Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is suggested that the GNR project consider developing a trial area and partners with acknowledged academic experts to produce a fact-based report for wide distribution.	Yes	Ecological monitoring, including with third parties, will be part of the Development. The specification for this work and the requirements for reporting will be outlined in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) but the final details are contingent on consent.
North Muskham Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The PC believe that consideration of the following species should be included in the future documentation:- Barn Owls, Deer, Hen Harriers – one of the UK's rarest birds of prey. (Conservation status – Hen Harrier Classified in the UK as Red under the Birds of Conservation Concern 5: the Red List for Birds (2021). Protected in the UK under the Wildlife and Countryside Act, 19). Residents have seen these on numerous occasions in and around North and South Muskham.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of these and other ecological features. The potential effects on them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
North Muskham Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is not clear whether the proposal considers the impact on the stated species above in regard of their natural and habitual behaviour to travel significant distances from their base habitat. This is especially relevant with Otter and to a lesser extent Badger. It is suggested that the report and study should include the impacts that the substantial fencing will have on these behaviours and the wellbeing and sustainability of habitats and be scoped in.	No	These potential effects are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
North Muskham Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Building solar farms usually means displacing large numbers of mammals, birds, insects, and other wildlife. This will be especially true for GNR given the currently unprecedented scale. Transitory animals have their traditional routes blocked, deer are often diverted onto roads, bird and bat deaths are common as they mistake the glass for water. The land is degraded with little potential for biodiversity as half of it will be in permanent shadow and rainwater run-off creates set channels without proper dispersal.	No	GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park will bring many benefits for wildlife, with 64,500 trees being planted, 50km of new hedgerow and over 1,000 acres of enhancement land set aside for biodiversity. The Development offers a 60% Biodiversity Net Gain for habitats, with

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				26% for hedgerows and 11% for watercourses. This is assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
North Muskham Parish Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	Our countryside is going to be industrialised by the development of largescale solar farms. Continuous rows of glass panels completely alter landscape character and boundaries are changed by security fencing and the intrusion of CCTV.	No	The effects of the Development on landscape character are assessed in chapter 7 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. As confirmed by the OEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]** , which is to be secured by requirement, Pole mounted internal facing closed-circuit television (CCTV) systems are also likely to be deployed around the perimeter of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				operational areas of the Development. Software masking of public areas will be applied where necessary to ensure privacy of the public.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Fields 82, 93, 109, 142 and 37 should be removed due potential reduction of habitat suitable for endangered species.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution notable and protected species in these fields and all other parts of the Order Limits. The potential effects on such species are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It has been identified that solar farms can have a negative impact on biodiversity through compaction of ground, cutting of grass in between panels, distance between panels, and the fencing off of large fields that prevent wildlife such as deer, foxes, badgers and other medium sized mammals gain access to woodland and other "cover" areas. Currently Moorhouse has an exceptionally healthy population of wildlife including tawny and barn owls, buzzards along with little egret and heron. All these broad range species will be negatively affected by the current proposal.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of these and other ecological features. The effects on them from a range of potential development impacts are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. The fencing design, outlined in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**, will include regular access point to allow the free transit of wildlife.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	In effect the solar park proposals in this area would surround long established wildlife rich woodland, effectively cutting it off for many species and have an adverse impact on many species during construction.	No	The Development has minimised effects on woodland and will create and enhance habitats to extend and improve connectivity among existing woodlands. Potential effects on woodland and associated wildlife are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The area is significant for rare and declining farmland and/or woodland birds, in particular the lapwing, which is classified as red (Birds of Conservation Concern 5: the Red List for Birds (2021)), a priority species (UK Post-2010 Biodiversity Framework) and near threatened global IUCN Red List of Threatened Species).	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of birds. The effects on them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.2.8], which includes mitigation for lapwing.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Laxton Sykes is a Site of Special Scientific Interest for great crested newts with Moorhouse and its surrounds lying within the impact risk zone.	No	Laxton Sykes SSSI is notified for its important neutral grasslands; great crested newt is not a notified feature. effects on Laxton Sykes SSSI are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	In 2017 a Natural England report stated that solar farms fragment habitats and solar panels can affect the movement of species, hiding places, preying strategies and availability of food. In particular, the proposed fields that border North Wood and Speakers plantation woodland, would have a major ecological impact on wildlife.	No	The solar PV to the north of North Wood has been removed from the Development. The impact of habitat fragmentation and solar panels on species' behaviours is assessed in ES Chapter 8,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Royal Horticultural Society advise (on their website) that planting should not take place if the ground is too wet or frozen. It is clear that there are going to be a lot of potential planting days lost, especially during the Winter.	Yes	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) specifies the timing of planting. which varies depending on the habitat feature. Habitat creation and enhancements, including tree planting, may start before construction and last until the start of operation, a period of more than two years.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The timescale set allows for 12 months of planting. This tree planting is in addition to new or replacement hedgerow planting. That is an average of over 4,100 trees each Autumn and Winter month.	No	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) specifies the timing of planting which varies depending on the habitat feature. Habitat creation

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and enhancements, including tree planting, may start before construction and last until the start of operation, a period of more than two years.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	In terms of who is to do this planting, it is planned to use local volunteers and members of the public. The Council welcomes the involvement of the Sherwood Forest Trust whose expertise will be valuable.	No	Planting is likely to be undertaken by both contractors and volunteers. The details will be determined post-consent.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Council also support the use of volunteers. However, in the case of there being slippage in tree planting progress, there should be a contingency plan, probably involving paying a professional organisation to assist.	No	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) specifies the timing of planting. Supply chain contracts and agreements will be in place to fulfil planting requirements.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	it would be useful to learn from the ES exactly what are the details of the inputs from Sherwood Forest Trust. Is it intended that they would be 'boots on the ground'?	No	The details of Sherwood Forest Trust's partnership and involvement are confidential, but they are providing advice about the landscape design and oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) and it is anticipated that they will supply trees and labour for the tree planting and woodland creation.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is clear that a significant amount of work has been completed to reach an ecological baseline against which the impacts of the development can be assessed. It is recognised that the full baseline picture is not presented in Appendices A08.4 and A08.5 as there will have been further analyses and surveying, post publication.	No	Further surveys and analyses are presented in ES TA A8.3 **[A8.3 EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]** to TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	What however is clear from the picture so far is the scale of proposed habitat loss, especially for red listed ground nesting birds. Such birds, such as skylarks avoid field boundaries, areas of regular human interference and tall structures, be they natural such as trees, or man made such as utility pylons.	No	The assessment of potential effects on ground-nesting birds is presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.80]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Development proposals smaller than this one, which if granted, would lead to habitat loss for ground nesting protected species, invariably describe the individual fields to be lost by occupation and acreage. This assists the scrutiny of any proposed mitigation/compensation proposals. This is regarded as good practice.	Yes	Individual fields are shown on Figures A8.4.1 and A8.4.2 (of TA A8.4: Breeding Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]**) in relation to the territories of breeding birds.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Applicant has divided the order limit area into 36 defined groups of individual fields. These groups do not visibly distinguish between panel and cabling fields. Elsewhere in the PEIR, since the Stage 1 consultation, the Applicant has now helpfully numbered each individual field.	Yes	Individual fields are shown on Figures A8.4.1 and A8.4.2 (of TA A8.4: Breeding Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]**) in relation to the territories of breeding birds. The 36 field

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				groupings are survey units for the Wintering Bird Survey (TA A8.5 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5]**).
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Council would wish this to be expanded upon if the Applicant is going to persist with the 36 groups. Presumably, the Applicant knows the acreage of each individual field as this no doubt would have been determined during the negotiations with each landowner.	Yes	Individual fields are shown on Figures A8.4.1 and A8.4.2 (of TA A8.4: Breeding Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]**) in relation to the territories of breeding birds. The 36 field groupings are survey units for the Wintering Bird Survey (TA A8.5 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5]**). Field areas are known from mapping data and software.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The impression the Applicant has given verbally is that all relevant landowners are cooperative.	No	There has been careful cooperation with landowners to progress lease negotiations and have good engagement.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The fact that this development covers large areas was the choice of the Applicant. This does make survey time more time consuming but that was a foreseeable cost which should have been planned for.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	This is important is that no doubt in the ES, there will be proposals for the chosen compensation fields.	No	The ES sets out mitigation proposals, including for birds, in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Applicants confirm in paragraph 195 of Chapter 8 that cable fields could be used for such fields. This makes it easier for the Applicant as they do not have to deal with any new landowner, not involved in the project. They also then do not have to survey that person's fields as well.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is also confirmed that lapwing and skylark plots will need to be created prior to construction on the fields for which they are meant to compensate.	No	Some mitigation for ground-nesting birds will be in place before the start of construction and thereafter will be phased in line with the construction programme. The exact programme will be determined post-consent in parallel with the construction programme.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Council would wish some clarification that where plots will be sited on cable fields, then are those cables going to be buried prior to construction on the fields currently supporting the birds?	No	All cables will be buried. Mitigation in the form of skylark 'plots' is not construction but is a management technique for the continued farming use of the fields, which is optimised for skylark. Farming of a field will have to temporarily cease while the cable

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				works are ongoing but can resume afterwards.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	If one knows the individual field sizes requiring compensation, then one can calculate of provisional habitat loss totals for areas within the order limits.	No	The extent of habitat losses, and associated mitigation proposals, are set out in detail in the ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Council would wish that the ES contains a table similar to table A8.5.2 in Appendix A8.5 but where the first column is entitled 'Field Number' referencing the numbers contained in Appendix A08.5A8.5.1.5. Further columns should be provided, indicating acreage and whether each field is a cable or panel field. It almost goes without saying that the Applicant should also provide field numbers for the planned compensation fields.	Yes	Field numbers are presented in Figure A8.5.1. The 36 field groupings are survey units for the Wintering Bird Survey (Technical Appendix A8.5 [**EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5]**) and a more meaningful way (compared to 321 individual field units) of presenting a large data set.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	In terms of the suitability of potential receptor fields for lapwing(nesting)and skylark plots, the Council would like to be confident that the Applicant will have regard to the guidance from DEFRA and Natural England.	No	Defra guidance has informed and is cited in the mitigation proposals set out in the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Applicant states in Appendix A05 page 21 that DEFRA Guidance AB5 on lapwing plots will be followed. In the actions, it fails to mention the constraining factors in AB5 regarding wind turbines or level ground. It does not take into account the further guidance contained in AB5 (as at 9.1.12 above) or the guidance from DEFRA at 9.1.11.	No	Defra guidance has informed the mitigation proposals set out in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) and ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Applicant omits the constraint that skylark plots should avoid "fields that are bordered by trees or next to woods as this increases the risks of predator attack." (Source AB4).	No	Defra guidance has informed the mitigation proposals set out in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				) and ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	As a bio-diversity park, no doubt that the Applicant would want to adopt best practices. If the partnership arrangement with the RSBP produces new field selection guidance for suitable receptor fields, it is wished that this be submitted separately by the RSBP so that it can be circulated nationally as their new guidance. If this does not happen, the Council would wish the Applicant to adopt all the location and design constraints listed above at 9.1.11 -9.1.16.	No	The recommendations in sections 9.1.11-9.1.16 the response are fully addressed by Defra guidance which, in turn, has informed the mitigation proposals set out in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) and ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Council notes that the Appendix A08 is not the definitive and final baseline for GCNs and that work is potentially ongoing. This presumably is the reason why at this stage, there is no information yet as to whether the development is in a risk zone for GCN or if any assessment has been made of strategic opportunity areas .	No	The Development is not in a Natural England great crested newt Risk Zone or Strategic Opportunity Area. Natural England has confirmed that there are

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				no plans for the area encompassed by the Order Limits to be included in such plans.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is clearly in the best interests of all parties for there to be an as complete baseline picture as possible. The Applicant identified 137 potential ponds that could be populated by GCNs. Of the 137, 45 were not accessed (33%). In some cases, the reason provided was the lack of safe access. Paragraph 25 of the Appendix states that all ponds not accessed were outside the order limits. The fact that all ponds within the limits have been surveyed is to be welcomed.	Yes	The number of ponds in the Study Area is now 111, of which 86 (77 %) have been accessed. All of the ponds within the Order Limits have been surveyed.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The 45 ponds for which there are no findings are still within the study area. A principal reason given for non assessment is that no access permission was obtained from the relevant landowner. This might be because these individuals were not inclined to assist Elements Green with this project because of their feelings about the proposed development. This Council's representative has had the opportunity to discuss the absent data with the Applicant's ecological consultant. It was stated that no approach has yet been made to	No	Letters were sent, on two separate occasions, to off-site landowners in early 2024 requesting access to their land to carry out great crested newt surveys. Further surveys will be undertaken post-consent / pre-construction (as set

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		any parish council to do this. This Council would be willing to so assist but clearly cannot speak for the other parish councils. However, it is possible this might be discussed at a joint forum.		out in the oCEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) to provide an up-to-date-baseline on which to base mitigation and possible licensing. The support of the Council in facilitating these surveys is welcome and may be sought at the appropriate time.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Fencing will keep human receptors at a distance from most of this plant. But mammal gates will hopefully allow free passage for smaller mammals, reptiles and amphibians. Birds and bats can also clearly roam freely within the development.	No	Details of the mammal passes incorporated into the fencing are provided in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**. Mammal gates will allow free movement of larger mammals (e.g. badger), but most small animals

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				will be able to pass through the fencing unimpeded.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Now that the Applicant has the majority of baseline data for wildlife populations, there is a requirement to examine the potential effects on these populations of the emitted frequencies. This wildlife will have existed in an area normally free from industrial noise. The installation of new industrial sound may have the effect of dispersing wildlife from the area, with a consequential net bio-diversity loss.	No	The effects of noise on animal species is assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The proposed Substation alongside Carlton Wood would significantly impact on the wildlife there and is not acceptable.	No	The effects of the substation on Carlton Wood and associated wildlife are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The land within Carlton-on-Trent parish is home to owls, bats and badgers; their habitats will be significantly disrupted during the construction phase making it unlikely they will return.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of notable

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and protected species in the area around Carlton-on-Trent and all other parts of the Order Limits. The potential effects on such species are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The identified biodiversity areas are already existing so not a means of increasing biodiversity or providing alternative habitats for displaced species.	No	Biodiversity benefits will be provided by retaining and enhancing some habitats and creating others. Additional biodiversity benefits are embedded in the Development, such as reducing the amounts of pesticides and fertilisers into the environment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The map of breeding birds does not match what has been observed locally, with tawny owls, sparrow hawks and kestrels seen and heard frequently in the parish in increasing numbers. The council would like to see further surveys undertaken.	No	The survey methods in the Breeding Birds Baseline (TA A8.4 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]**) follow good practice and are a standardised and repeatable method to determine the breeding status and location of birds. The locally observed activity of birds does not necessarily reflect the breeding status of the species, although the reported increases are encouraging.
National Fire Chiefs Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Suitable environmental protection measures should be provided.	No	The oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES), oOEMP (TA A5.5 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and oDRP (TA A5.6 of the ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]) set out environmental protection measures.
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	There are several areas of Ancient Semi Natural Woodland (ASNW) and Plantation on Ancient Woodland sites (PAWS) immediately adjacent to the proposed site including North Wood, Speakers Plantation, High Wood, Dukes Wood, Mather Wood, Lady Wood. Cheveral Wood, Musk Wood, Spring Wood and Carlton Wood. Some of which will constrained on 2 or more sides by the development.	No	Ancient Woodland has been identified in TA A8.3: Habitats and Vegetation Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]** .
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	Whilst we note that plans include a 15m buffer from Ancient Woodlands, the Standing Advice states that proposals should have a buffer zone of at least 15m from the boundary of ancient woodlands to avoid root damage which can result in loss or deterioration of the woodland. Where assessment shows impacts are likely to extend beyond this distance, you're likely to need a larger buffer zone.	No	The AIA (TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) assesses potential effects on ancient woodland and specifies control measures to safeguard them.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	Direct impacts can include, but are not limited to, damaging or compacting soil, damaging functional habitat connections and changing the woodland ecosystem by removing the woodland edge or thinning trees. Indirect impacts can also include increasing the amount of dust, light, air or soil pollution and changing the landscape character of the area.	No	effects on woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. Effects on landscape character are considered in ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	We would expect to see a detailed assessment of any impacts to the ancient woodland, including details of measures to be taken to reduce and mitigate any effect. Protection measures include taking care not to cut tree roots (e.g., by trenching) or causing soil compaction around trees (e.g., through vehicle movements or stacking heavy equipment) or contamination from poisons (e.g., site stored fuel or chemicals) and fencing off these areas to prevent unintended incursions into the root protection zone	No	Potential effects on woodland and ancient woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	Fragmentation is one of the greatest threats to mixed deciduous woodland. Woodlands can suffer loss or deterioration from nearby development through loss of connectivity, damage to soils, roots and vegetation and changes to drainage and air pollution from an increase in traffic or dust, particularly during the construction phase of a development.	No	The Development has sought to minimise impacts to woodland, principally by avoiding works in or near it. The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes extensive woodland and hedgerow creation and tree planting, much of which aims to increase connectivity among, or to expand and buffer, existing woodlands. Potential effects on woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	Due to the irreplaceable nature of ancient woodland, most temporary effects will result in irreplaceable damage.	No	Potential effects on woodland and ancient woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. No adverse effects are predicted.
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	We note there are several areas of mixed deciduous woodland both within the site area and adjacent to it. Mixed Deciduous woodlands are on the National Forest Inventory and the Priority Habitat Inventory (England). They were recognized under the UK Biodiversity Action Plan as being the most threatened, requiring conservation action. The UK Biodiversity Action Plan has now been superseded but this priority status remains under the Natural Environment & Rural Communities Act 2006. (NERC) Sect 40 "Duty to conserve and enhance biodiversity" and Sect 41 – "List of habitats and species of principle importance in England".	No	Mixed deciduous woodland has been identified as a Priority Habitat in TA A8.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]** . Potential effects on woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	Fragmentation is one of the greatest threats to mixed deciduous woodland. Woodlands can suffer loss or deterioration from nearby development through loss of connectivity, damage to soils, roots and vegetation and changes to drainage and air pollution from an increase in traffic or dust, particularly during the construction phase of a development.	No	The Development has sought to minimise impacts to woodland, principally by avoiding works in or near it. The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes extensive woodland, ecotone and hedgerow creation and tree planting, much of which aims to increase connectivity among, or to expand and buffer, existing woodlands. Potential effects on woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	We note plans include the retention of existing trees and woodland with plans to plant approximately 50,000 trees. We are pleased to note that some of these planned areas for newly created woodland are adjacent to existing woodland so will be creating good habitat links. It is important that woodland creation is not just used as screening at strategic locations and ensures habitat connectivity throughout the landscape. Particularly in areas adjacent to existing woodland, which will help to make woodlands more resilient and to benefit biodiversity across the whole landscape. Ideally we would like to see woodland creation to be carried out in 5ha blocks or that connecting planting with existing woodlands, should create blocks of at least 5ha. Newly planted woodland could also be used as a buffer between the development and existing ancient woodlands.	No	The Development has sought to minimise impacts to woodland, principally by avoiding works in or near it. The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes extensive woodland, hedgerow and ecotone creation and tree planting, much of which aims to increase connectivity among, or to expand and buffer, existing woodlands. Potential effects on woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	The species and provenance of new trees and woodland needs to be considered to ensure a resilient treescape which can cope with the full implications of a changing climate.	No	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes planting specifications that take account of climate change and provenance.
Forestry Commission	Ecology and biodiversity	The biosecurity of all planting stock also needs to be considered to avoid the introduction of pests and diseases, particularly in areas where there are ancient woodlands. Plans should also be in place to ensure the long term management and maintenance of new and existing woodland, including deer and squirrel control, perhaps by creation of a UK Forestry Standard compliant management plan, with access also needing to be considered for future management.	Yes	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes a commitment to sourcing all planting stock locally and in line with prevailing biosecurity good practice. The oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** also sets out the long-term management prescriptions for woodland which will reference the UK Forestry Standard (2023), noting that detailed management

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				plans may not be developed until after consent is obtained.
National Highways	Ecology and Biodiversity	The study area provided in the glint and glare assessment indicates that the majority of effects will not be significant. b. Some of the receptor locations identified in the LVIA within their study area have the potential to retain views of the site for a number of years which may occur outside of the study area identified within the Glint and Glare assessment. c. Receptor locations should be cross-checked to see those located within the LVIA study area could be affected.	No	Noted.
Weston Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	What provisions will be put in place to preserve wildlife in the area during and after construction. The countryside around Weston has many different species of wildlife - Badgers, Foxes, Deer, Bats, Game birds, native and visiting birds, Birds of prey.	No	Potential effects on wildlife during construction and operation are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, which includes details of mitigation, compensation

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and enhancement. The oCEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) provide further details of these measures.
Weston Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The villages hedges are in a poor state generally. Many have been lost due to attack by ivy etc. and finances have prohibited the reinstatement of hedges along footpaths and fields. Further disruption will also affect these hedges and ruin our wildlife and nesting birds and our biodiversity. The reinstatement of affected hedges is essential and support to landowners, including myself, for the repair of existing hedges would be of benefit and mitigate the impact on us all.	No	Potential effects on hedgerows are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, which includes details of mitigation, compensation and enhancement. The oCEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) provide further details of these measures, including the creation of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				42 km of new hedgerows.
Canal & River Trust	Ecology and biodiversity	It is noted that Section 8.6.4 (Lighting) identifies the intended 'dark sky' policy. The Trust encourages the intended sensitive lighting design in the interests of reducing disturbance to nocturnal and crepuscular species common to our, and wider, local assets. The Construction Ecological Management Plan should address these matters for the construction phase of the scheme and wider lighting scheme design for subsequent operational phases and these should be included in the requirements of the draft DCO.	No	The details of the sensitive lighting design are included in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** and ES Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The impact on our wildlife and hedgerows and plants will be significant during construction and operational phases	No	Potential effects on wildlife during construction and operation are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, which includes details of mitigation, compensation and enhancement. The oCEMP (TA A5.3

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]) and oOEMP (TA A5.5 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]**) provide further details of these measures. No significant adverse effects are predicted.
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The fields to be panelled within the parish currently provide natural habitats for protected species which will be lost (ground nesting birds such as lapwing and skylarks) or severely altered. Although not a favoured pursuit of all, our land is used by the Readyfield bloodhounds and also the Grove and Rufford hunt, this pursuit is part of our heritage and removing these panelled field from their rides restricts and puts more pressure on remaining land. We also have game bird breeding areas which might need relocating.	No	Potential effects on wildlife, including ground nesting birds, are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, which includes details of mitigation, compensation and enhancement. The oCEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) provide further details of these measures. No

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				significant adverse effects are predicted.
Maplebeck Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is good to see proposals for tree planting but residents requested that the planting programme include some more mature, established trees. Small whips would take many years to develop and many current residents feel they may never see the benefit .	No	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) provides details of the trees to be planted, which includes a range of sizes and species appropriate to local conditions and a variety of purposes.
Eakring Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Regularly observed in the fields to be panelled include protected bird species such as: Yellowhammer, Skylark, Lapwing, Tree sparrow, Starling, Yellow wagtail, Linnet, Fieldfare, Greenfinch along with Kestrels, Red kite and Buzzards. Of special note are the Barn owls which are regularly seen hunting across the field's thanks in part to the Barn Owl Trust who have been instrumental in working with local farmers to increase their numbers. The fields to be panelled are home to Brown hares while deer, foxes and the occasional badger have also been spotted. Bats are seen regularly around the village and hunting along	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of these and other notable and protected species in the area around Eakring. The potential effects on all of the named species are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		hedgerows. Water voles are confirmed present in the Caunton Beck that runs adjacent to field DB018. Security fencing and large areas of panels will disrupt and destroy the traditional pathways for such animals and birds along with their nesting and feeding habitats.		Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. No significant adverse effects are predicted.
Eakring Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Within the order limits and close to Eakring are Eakring Meadows LWS, partly designated an SSSI and Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI. Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI is important for its species rich neutral grassland on damp soils derived from river alluvium over clay. Additional interest is provided by the variety of breeding bird species using the site and the notable wildflower populations. These habitats will be negatively impacted by the solar farm.	No	Potential effects on Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI and Eakring Meadows LWS are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. No significant adverse effects are predicted.
Eakring Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Within the parish and not far from field DB015 is Redgate Woods and Mansey Common SSSI Grid Reference SK 680 600 which is just over 71 ha's. The citation reads:" Redgate Woods are a fine example of an Ash- Elm Wood developed on stiff clay. Additional interest is provided by species rich glades and a breeding bird population. Mansey Common is a good	No	Redgate Woods and Mansey Common SSSI is identified in TA A8.2: Ecology Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]** , but is scoped out of the assessment in Table 8.7

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		example of a species rich neutral grassland derived from stiff clay.		of ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Eakring Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Additional interest is provided by the adjoining section of "dumble" a narrow, steep – sided wooded valley that possess a ground flora similar to the flushed slopes of ancient woodland.	No	The dumble to the north of Redgate Woods and Mansey Common SSSI is not formally designated and is outside the Order Limits. This area would be scoped out for the same reasons as Redgate Woods and Mansey Common SSSI.
Eakring Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The Woodland Trust have recorded two Ancient Trees of significance in Eakring. One in the church yard of St Andrew's the other on the corner of the access track to Field DB017.	No	The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) (TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) includes consideration of Ancient and Veteran trees.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Eakring Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Dukes Wood is now a wildlife reserve managed by Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust although signs of its past can still be seen within the wood. Dukes wood is visited by historians, wildlife enthusiasts, walkers etc. both from within and outside the village.	No	Dukes Wood is part of Redgate Woods LWS and has been identified in TA A8.2: Ecology Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]** , but scoped out of the assessment in Table 8.7 of ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Questions as to need, positioning of the planned solar arrays along with the reality of the actual ecological benefits to this area are not addressed well enough in the proposal and leave many questions and worries unanswered.	No	ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** provides details of the site selection process. Solar PV has been removed from the immediate vicinity of South Muskham and Little Carlton, but the mitigation and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				enhancement areas have been retained. Details of the management of these areas are provided in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	We are extremely lucky with the wildlife that we currently have, who call the fields in and around South Muskham and Little Carlton their home. Even being so close to Newark, the Al, A616 and East Coast Main Line, the area teems with a diverse mix of birds, animals and insects. There are currently no proposed compensation measures to deal with loss of habitat. The fields where it is planned to place solar panels provides ground nesting for Short-eared Owls, Grey (English) Partridge, Skylarks, Lapwings and other species. We also have Kingfishers - seen only two weeks ago for the first time in the field marked for construction. The presence of the Kingfisher determines that the small watercourses through the fields have fish inhabitants. Swans - we regularly have	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution notable and protected species in the area around South Muskham and Little Carlton, as well as the wider Order Limits. Solar PV has been removed from the immediate vicinity of South Muskham and Little Carlton, but the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		pairs raising their cygnets on the lakes and the stream that pass through the field that runs along the B6325. We also have Grey Herons (including a local heronry).		mitigation and enhancement areas have been retained. Potential ecological effects are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is difficult to discern from the plans whether the established woodland off Crow Lane is to be removed. This area of established woodland provides a nesting space for Buzzards and provides an observation point for Red Kites when hunting. It should not be lost. These fields and woodlands are a vital cog in providing habitat for plants and animals and the biodiversity helps maintain ecological balance and resilience.	No	The woodland off Crow Lane will not be removed. The habitats to the north-east of the woodland, either side of the stream (which is a continuation of Moorhouse Drain LWS), will be managed for ecological mitigation and enhancement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 has not been included in the list of legislation that is relevant to biodiversity. The legal responsibility on the developer pertaining to this fish specific legislation has not been considered. This infers the impacts on fish from the construction, operation and decommissioning have not been fully considered. This legislation should be listed and considered in the biodiversity chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) and submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO). Parts of The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 relevant to this type of development and that should be considered, are (but not exhaustive) Part 1, Sections 2 and 4.	Yes	The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 is now included in the list of legislation in section 8.3 of ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. effects on fish are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Not all protected fish species present have been included in the baseline data for fish. Protected fish species may be negatively impacted by the scheme, Given that river lamprey and sea lamprey are in the River Trent, it is likely that lamprey species are present in the Moorhouse Beck, The Beck and Pingley Dyke, and thus should be included in the baseline data.	Yes	River lamprey is now included in TA A8.9: Other Notable and Protected Species **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.9] and** assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Any culverting of a watercourse or waterbody that contains fish can impact on lifecycle migration, both locally and long distance. Culverting also impacts fish habitat and spawning habitat by decreasing the quality of substrate. The long-term effects of culverting of watercourses could lead to a deterioration in WFD status. Culverting watercourses should be avoided at first, and where possible, be replaced by a full span crossing that maintains the natural substrate and allows free fish passage. The ES and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)should include details of where any watercourse crossing will take place, and how they will be designed to ensure impacts on fish are negligible. Additional Information: Please refer to our comments above regarding Culverts (Chapter 5 Development Description and Chapter 9 Water Resources, Sections: 5.4.3.7, 9.6.1.2 and 9.6.1.3	Yes	A list of watercourse crossings is included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and specifies the crossing method at each location. The potential effects of these watercourse crossings are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, with reference to ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Insufficient mitigation for fish during the diversion of watercourses and open cut trenching. Harm/mortality to fish (including protected fish species) and loss of habitat. If this falls during key fish migratory periods, this could significantly impact on spawning success	Yes	The Outline CEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) includes detailed mitigation for fish . The

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and at worst significantly reduce recruitment in watercourses. This in turn could lead to a deterioration in WFD status. This is dependent on the time take for open cut trenching. Robust mitigation should be in place and included in the CEMP to ensure fish and their habitat are protected. This is likely to include a fish rescue, continued connectivity for fish passage, avoiding spawning/migration times, and ensuring that eel screens are fitted to pump inlets and outlets.		Further details about watercourse crossings are provided in other response to the EA under the Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage theme.
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Insufficient evidence behind proposed mitigation for effects of Electro Magnetic Fields (EMF). Protected fish species maybe impacted by EMFs. Whilst we agree that depth and insulation of cables can mitigate the effects of EMFs on fish. Evidence should present that a depth of 5m will reduce the impact of EMF on fish to negligible levels. Providing an assessment and quantification of the strength of EMF levels at bed of the watercourse at 5m depth would be useful. Furthermore, clear details of watercourse and cable crossing locations, and details of fish present, will help understand the level of risk.	Yes	The effects of EMFs on fish are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, with reference to TA A8.14 Electromagnetic Fields and Fish **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.14]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Culverts have the potential to fragment habitats and reduce connectivity, making dispersal and commuting for species difficult. They also increase pressure on otters during periods of high water-levels, as they offer little room for conveyance and put otters at risk of being killed when crossing roads. Clear-span bridges should be considered if watercourse crossings are required, as these maintain habitat connectivity and allow species to commute freely. Additional Information: Please refer to our comments above regarding Culverts (Chapter 5 Development Description and Chapter 9 Water Resources, Sections: 5.4.3.7, 9.6.1.2 and 9.6.1.3)and Culverts (Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity, Section: 8.6.3).	Yes	A list of watercourse crossings is included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) and specifies the crossing method at each location. The potential effects of these watercourse crossings are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, with reference to ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Otters are legally protected by the Conservation of Habitats and Species (Amendment) (EU Exit) Regulations 2019, and under the Wildlife and Countryside Act (As Amended) 1981. They are also listed as a Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) priority species.	No	The legal and conservation status of otter is provided in TA A8.8: Otter, Water Vole and White-clawed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Crayfish Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.8]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Water voles are protected under the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. The Environment Agency have a statutory duty to ensure the conservation of water vole and their environment under the Environment Act 1995. Water Vole are listed as a BAP species.	No	The legal and conservation status of water vole is provided in TA A8.8 Otter, Water Vole and White-clawed Crayfish Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.8]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Environmental legislation does not list some recent (2024) legislation pertaining Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). Risk of not considering new environmental definitions in legislation in respect of BNG, such as 'irreplaceable habitat,' along with related offences to said habitats. Include references to the following legislation, policy and guidance: Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024, for completeness.	Yes	The Biodiversity Gain Requirements (Irreplaceable Habitat) Regulations 2024 do not currently apply to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects. However, for consistency with the approach presented for Biodiversity Net Gain, the Regulations are now cited in TA A8.13: Biodiversity Net Gain

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Otter status has been noted as 'absent' if no field signs were identified. Otter presence cannot definitively be ruled-out if signs are not found. Otter populations may be unknowingly impacted if their presence isn't assumed and mitigated for. Extend otter mitigation detailed in CEMP to all watercourses that hold water (such as maintaining a means for otters to move across work areas, outside of work hours). Otters are now known to occupy the majority of watercourses in England (06 National Otter Survey), therefore their presence on any watercourse should now be assumed. Otters are also known to utilise smaller watercourses for commuting or foraging.	Yes	Otter presence has been assumed on all suitable watercourses. This assumption is now outlined in TA A8.8: Otter, Water Vole and White-clawed Crayfish Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.8]** and reflected in the assessment of potential effects in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	The proposal does not contribute to WFD targets of improving the water quality status via in-channel habitat enhancements. We recommend that the applicant includes in-channel habitat enhancement measures. This could be achieved through increasing the in-channel habitat diversity, improving channel	No	In-channel habitat enhancements have not been included at this stage. The BNG Assessment (TA A 8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.1**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		morphology and removing barriers. Considering that some of the rivers and their tributaries (such as the Beck and Moorhouse Beck) are physically modified, the project should aim to improve the WFD classification of these watercourses.		**3]**) demonstrates a net gain in watercourse units.
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Potential widescale distribution impacts to macroinvertebrates. Invertebrates are a WFD biological quality element. Impacts to them can risk a deterioration in a WFD waterbody's status. Address this concern and explain why invertebrates won't be impacted in a significant way (such as with mitigation through panel design). Otherwise, we'd require specific monitoring or offsetting.	Yes	Since PEIR, solar PV has been removed from a large part of the south-east of the Order Limits, the part of the site closest to the River Trent corridor and potentially most important for macroinvertebrates. Similarly, solar PV is not proposed in large areas around key watercourses to create riparian corridors within which sympathetic habitat management will take place. The assessment of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				potential effects on macroinvertebrates is in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Expiration of water vole surveys (beyond 2 years).Underestimate the presence of water voles in the works corridors. We would expect two surveys to occur again during the optimal survey season. This includes one occurring mid-April – end of June and the other July – September (inclusive), at least two months apart according to best practise (Water Vole Mitigation Handbook, 2016).	Yes	The legal and conservation status of otter is provided in TA A8.8: Otter, Water Vole and White-clawed Crayfish Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.8]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Mitigation and compensation actions may not be proportionate to impacts to water vole. Water vole recovery in the county may be hindered if a joined-up approach to habitat enhancement is not taken. We request to see more detailed plans of mitigation and enhancement proposed for water vole. Discuss future water vole mitigation and enhancement opportunities with the Environment Agency and Wildlife Trust, to provide the best outcomes for water vole. As part of water vole enhancement/mitigation, mink trapping can	Yes	Water vole mitigation and enhancement opportunities have been discussed with the Environment Agency and Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust. These opportunities have become commitments in the ES Chapter 8,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		be included on the Beck and Moorhouse Beck as well as their tributaries. This would link with the current extents of water vole recovery programmes in Nottinghamshire. In addition, water vole habitat enhancements could be proposed as part of these works. This could offset potential impacts and encourage their recolonisation in this area during the lifetime of the project. An opportunity would be missed to significantly contribute to water vole recovery. As water vole have been identified at several locations in the study area (and more locations may be identified from yet unpublished 2024 survey results).		Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	Spread of Invasive Non-Native Species (INNS).Check, clean, dry biosecurity measures should be implemented as standard as best practise, to avoid the transmission of INNS	Yes	Biosecurity measures are now included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**)
Environment Agency	Ecology and biodiversity	BNG is mentioned in Chapter 8, but there is no mention of the Watercourse metric, which is underpinned by the geomorphology/hydromorphology of the watercourse. We note that BNG is not yet mandatory, however we recommend that it is addressed in order to ensure the impact on the water	No	A commitment to providing a net gain in watercourse units was outlined in section 8.4.1.5 of ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		environment is fully understood. The applicant should prepare for this eventuality by conducting MoRPH surveys and River Condition Assessments for all watercourses within and in close proximity to the development boundary.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** of the PEIR. The gain in watercourse units, based on MoRPh and condition surveys of watercourses, is presented in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (TA 8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	In respect of Biodiversity and Ecology, NSDC acknowledge that Chapter 8 of the PEIR does not include a comprehensive assessment of all potential effects due to the evolving project design, which is being informed by ongoing baseline studies. We commend the ongoing design evolution through the integration of ecological assessments to refine areas with potentially significant effects. However, we are concerned that the PEIR has not fully addressed the extent of impacts during the operational and decommissioning phases. Specifically, the loss of higher value vegetation during decommissioning has not been adequately considered.	No	Ecological constraints and opportunities have continued to influence the Development Design. The loss of higher value vegetation during decommissioning is addressed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. The Environmental

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Impact Assessment (EIA) methodology (ES Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**) requires decommissioning effects on be assessed against the current 'do nothing' baseline rather the baseline at the time of decommissioning.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Methodology within the PEIR is considered within sections 8.4.1 - 8.4.2 and within the accompanying Technical Appendices. At this stage, because the detail of many elements is not fixed a worst-case scenario approach has been taken, and we agree with this approach	No	A reasonable worst-case scenario is assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. This precautionary approach helps to assess aspects of the Development that cannot be fully defined with the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				submission and helps to address uncertainties in the ecological baseline.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The project will be operational for 40 years, and it is an expectation that there will only be routine maintenance and small-scale repairs during the operational period. Given that the assessment is based on worst-case scenarios and given the pace of technology, further information should be provided if there are plans to replace any of the solar panels during the operational period. This should include the phases in which this may take place and assessment of any further effects on ecological receptors.	No	Section 5.6.2 of ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** of the PEIR defines the operation phase activities, including the replacement of infrastructure and solar PV modules. These activities were assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** of the PEIR. The operation phase activities, and therefore the assessment of potential ecological

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				effects, remains unchanged in the ES.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	We welcome the adopted 5m buffers to hedgerows and 15m buffers to woodland and trees identified to date within the baseline assessment and understand that a detailed assessment of potential arboricultural impacts will follow a screening exercise, to include an Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA) where appropriate. We would like to continue to discuss the approach to the arboricultural assessment as it progresses.	No	Tree, hedgerow and woodland buffers have continued to guide development design and the scope of the Arboricultural Impact Assessment (AIA), which is presented in TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	In our previous consultation response on 01/12/23, we expressed concerns that initial surveys were undertaken in suboptimal survey months (January and October 2022). The PEIR has confirmed that additional survey work, including habitat condition assessments for Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG), is being undertaken. However, we are concerned that paragraph 23 of section A8.3.2.2 of TA 8.3 indicates that the 2024 surveys will target a sample of areas and focus on notable habitats. We acknowledge the scale of the site and support where appropriate that a proportionate	No	Habitat surveys were initiated across much of the study area before UKHab methods became accepted good practice and before the prevailing Defra biodiversity metric (to calculate Biodiversity Net Gain, BNG), including its condition

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		approach has been undertaken and agree that much of the arable land will not have changed substantially since the initial surveys. However, we take the view that all notable habitats, including all hedgerows, watercourses, corridors, trees, and grassland (including notable field margins) should be subject to a full habitat assessment at the optimal time of year and will be required to inform the proposed BNG assessment. This should also include the newly proposed circular long-distance route, as it passes through woodland that is a Habitat of Principal Importance (HPI) such as Arnouts Woodland adjacent to Sunnybrook Farm.		assessments and reliance on the UKHab method, was released. Some of the early habitat surveys were undertaken outside the optimal survey period, but later surveys of new areas were carried out during the optimum period and included resurveys of a sample of areas/habitats surveyed during sub-optimal periods. Due to the long duration of the Development's pre-submission phase, the habitat surveys have been undertaken against a backdrop of changing methods and guidance, and it should be noted

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				that there is not yet any guidance for BNG in relation to Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects, which remain exempt from mandatory BNG. The approach taken to the habitat surveys and BNG has attempted to address changing guidance and provides a robust baseline against which to assess potential effects. Habitat-specific surveys, such as Arboricultural Survey and river MoRPh survey, have provided additional detailed data. The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment is based on an illustrative

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				design which, following consent, will be developed into a final design. Consequently, the BNG calculation will be updated to reflect the final design. Additional habitat surveys and condition assessments will also be undertaken post-consent to provide reliable and up-to-date baseline data.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Paragraph 19 within section 8.4.14 of the PEIR states that "hedgerows that may need to be removed will be surveyed to determine their potential to qualify as 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations 1997". Given that all hedgerows within the site OL should have been mapped in accordance with UKHab and undergone a habitat condition assessment to inform the proposed BNG assessment, it is considered that the information collected should be sufficient to assess	No	UKHab and BNG condition assessment methods do not provide the necessary information to determine whether or not a hedgerow classifies as 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations. However, the surveys

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		each hedgerow against the Hedgerow Regulations criteria.		help to identify hedgerows with the potential to be classified as important, based on achieving a minimum species richness, and these have been identified. Furthermore, the Development will be exempted from obtaining LPA consent before removing hedgerows under regulation 6(1) of the Regulations. The oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) and AIA (TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) include mitigation for hedgerows. The oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				) includes hedgerow enhancement and creation which will yield a net gain in hedgerow units (TA A8.13 BNG Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are recognised by central government as an important tool in promoting sustainable development and protecting biodiversity. We recommended in our previous consultation response that the Nottinghamshire LWS Handbook10 should be used as part of the assessment process to determine ecological importance. Paragraph 25 of section 8.4.2.1 of the PEIR claims that the application of these guidelines is confounded by the scale of the Development and difficulties in defining boundaries. Guidance for selecting site boundaries for LWS are provided at section 7.4 of Part 1 of the handbook and we further encourage the use of these criteria, particularly with reference to LBAP habitats and species identified within the site.	Yes	Local Wildlife Site selection guidelines have been more fully applied in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and the relevant Technical Appendices.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Since our previous comments on 01/12/24, NSDC have adopted an interim BNG policy regarding 'strategic significance' for Biodiversity Net Gain assessments. NSDC note that this policy has not been included in section 6.4.1.3 (Local Planning Policy) of Chapter 6 of the PEIR or listed at section 8.3 of Chapter 8. NSDC consider it should have been included as this is a relevant adopted document. If the Nottingham and Nottinghamshire Local Nature Recovery Strategy has not been published by the time that any BNG calculations relating to land falling within the Newark and Sherwood District undertaken, NSDC consider that this policy should be followed.	Yes	The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (TA A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**), which includes the BNG calculation, has adopted this approach.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It would be useful to have a list of statutory and non-statutory designated sites that have been scoped out of the project assessment. References are made within the PEIR to the benefits of creating corridors between LWSs and it is recommended that Kersall Grassland LWS & Hunt's Meadow LWS should be scoped into the assessment due to their proximity and hydrological connections to Eakring and Mapleback Meadows SSSI. Similarly, NSDC view that Norwell Meadows LWS should be scoped in due to connectivity to The	Yes	The sites scoped into the assessment in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]** are those in or bordering the Order Limits, as shown in Table A8.2.2 in TA A8.2: Ecology and Biodiversity

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Beck – Norwell LWS that passes through the site. It is recognised that the arboricultural assessment is ongoing, and that the site has largely excluded woodland blocks. However, given the location of the proposed development and potential for effects on ancient woodland the applicant should scope in potential effects on this habitat. The ES chapter should confirm whether any mature trees are considered to be veteran and address these specific receptors where significant effects are likely to occur.		Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]** . Kersall Grassland LWS and Hunt's Meadow LWS have now been scoped into the assessment in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**. Norwell Meadows LWS has been scoped out because the Development design no longer affects this area. Potential effects on woodland and ancient woodland, including ancient and veteran trees, are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**. The AIA (TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) provides details about Ancient and Veteran trees and associated mitigation.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	A preliminary assessment of designated sites is provided in sections 8.8.2 to 8.8.7 of the PEIR, and NSDC welcome the inclusion of the Sherwood Forest ppSPA following our initial scoping comments. However, NSDC note that it is missing from the methodology section of TA 8.2. It is understood that consultation with Natural England is ongoing regarding Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) requirements and the location of the site within an Impact Risk Zone (IRZ). The distance and direction of the designations in tables A8.2.1 and A8.2.2 of TA 8.2 are helpful. Adding numerical references in the table to link each designation to Figures A8.2.1 and A8.2.2 would be beneficial.	Yes	Methods in the Ecology Designated Sites Baseline (TA A8.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]**) now include the ppSPA. A Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) Screening Report is provided as document 5.7. Numerical references have not been added to Figures A8.2.1 and A8.2.2 in TA A8.2

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2] to help maintain consistency within and among documents.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Target notes are referenced in TA 8.3, but they are not currently displayed on Figure A8.3.1, which should include the locations of identified non-native plant species. Additionally, watercourses, especially other rivers, and streams, are not clearly shown on this figure. It is recommended that these features be included and labelled for the submission of the ES chapter.	Yes	Target Notes are no longer included in the Habitats and Vegetation Baseline (TA 8.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]**); instead, field numbers are used to facilitate cross references between the report and the figures. Watercourses are now presented more clearly in TA A8.3: Habitats and Vegetation Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Priority Habitats within the site were identified through a desk study. However, it is unclear from the PEIR and accompanying TA whether these areas have been verified through field surveys. As previously mentioned, NSDC believe the Nottinghamshire LWS handbook should be used in the assessment to reevaluate the LWS confirmed to be present within the site	No	Priority habitats have been surveyed and their potential to qualify as priority habitats determined. Details are provided in TA A8.3: Habitats and Vegetation Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]** LWS within the Order Limits have not been reevaluated against the LWS guidelines. The condition of the LWS and their qualifying features is assumed to be the same as their citations.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Whilst it is helpful to know the number of ponds within the site, these should also be quantified in terms of area within Table 8.5.	Yes	The total area of ponds is provided in TA A8.3: Habitats and Vegetation Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The site is predominantly comprised of arable land, with most arable margins recorded as their constituent grassland type. Arable field margins Priority Habitat is a declining habitat within the UK. Given the presence of rare and scarce arable plants identified within the site NSDC consider there should be an assessment to determine whether any arable margins meet the UK BAP definition.	Yes	Arable field margins of most types (as listed in the UKBAP definition) are common in the agricultural landscape covered by the Order Limits, although their type and location varies between years. The value of arable field margins is in the context of modern intensive agricultural landscape where they provide refuge for many species. Arable field margins are transient habitats and determined by prevailing agricultural land-use preferences and, unlike other semi-natural habitats, are generally not limited in the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				landscape. The Development will create a range of habitats with equal or greater value than existing arable margins, although it will also maintain some margins in cultivation, thus conserving and possibly improving conditions for many of the species associated with arable field margins. Arable field margins are scoped out of the assessment in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The PEIR references 'riparian woodland' at locations such as TN2. NSDC recommend specifying whether any woodland within the site qualifies as 'wet woodland.' Additionally, lines of trees recorded along watercourses, as mentioned in paragraph 57 of A8.3.2.13 of TA 8.3, are likely remnants of hedgerows associated with scattered scrub. If this scrub forms a canopy layer over the trees, the technical appendix should consider whether these features meet any UKHab definitions of woodland and, depending on their composition and ground conditions, whether they qualify as 'wet woodland.' This consideration could apply to areas like Knesall Dumble LWS.	Yes	Further details about these habitats is presented in TA A8.3: Habitats and Vegetation Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]** Wet woodland has not been identified.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Appendix B of TA 8.3 provides a summary of rare plant records identified during the desk study. At paragraph 27 of A8.3.3.1.2 'Nottinghamshire Rare Plant Register' of TA 8.3 it is stated that there are a total of 26 species of rare, scarce, or threatened plants that were recorded within the study area. Only 16 of these have an Asterix in Appendix B. The ES chapter should confirm how many species have been identified through the desk study within the site and how many have been confirmed during update field surveys.	Yes	Clarification is provided in TA A8.3: Habitats and Vegetation Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The PEIR and TA 8.8 confirm that no evidence of white-clawed crayfish has been found to date, excluding the results of the 2024 surveys. However, paragraph A8.8.3.2 of TA 8.8 mentions an unconfirmed crayfish sighting in 2022 along a watercourse identified in the PEIR as Pingley Dyke. The eDNA test result was negative, leading to the assumption that the sighting was likely a signal crayfish. NSDC recommend conducting a targeted presence/absence survey of this watercourse to verify the record and provide a more robust assessment of the absence of white-clawed crayfish.	No	The cable route will use Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) to pass under Pingley Dyke and avoid impacts to the freshwater and riparian habitats and species. Irrespective, the baseline studies undertaken provide an adequate baseline for assessment. Additional post-consent / pre-construction surveys may be undertaken, if required.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Assessment of likely significant effects on Earkring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI. Section 8.8.4 of the PEIR describes the location of the SSSI in relation to the site and how it is uncertain how the boundary of the SSSI relates to the highway boundary. From a review of aerial mapping data, it appears that the site does overlap with the SSSI boundary but that the road verge associated with the unclassified road might not overlap	Yes	The boundary of the Order Limits has been revised to be congruent with the boundary of Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI. The Environmental Impact Assessment

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the SSSI boundary due to its narrow diameter. This point should be confirmed within the ES Chapter and any indirect impacts to the SSSI fully evaluated. Impacts from decommissioning need further consideration. Operational impacts are viewed as beneficial due to the creation and enhancement of additional habitat around The Beck SSSI located downstream of this ecological receptor. If these habitats are then reverted to intensively managed farmland, NSDC consider this to be a negative impact.		(EIA) methodology (ES Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**) requires decommissioning effects on be assessed against the current 'do nothing' baseline rather the baseline at the time of decommissioning. This is the approach presented in ES Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The inclusion of embedded buffers to hedgerows, trees, woodlands, and watercourse is appreciated. It should be clarified if the 10m bank top buffer to watercourses is extended to ditches and NSDC suggest that a 5m buffer to this habitat would be appropriate. Further detail will be provided within the	No	A buffer distance of 5 m from ditches is specified in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		ES Chapter, and it is suggested the quantification of unavoidable habitat loss is presented in greater detail, which should be evident within the forthcoming BNG assessment.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Paragraph 204 of section 8.8.8 of the PEIR lists non-agricultural habitat Important Ecological Features (IEFs) that have the potential to be affected but omits mature trees. Where individual mature trees are located outside of constituent habitats such as hedgerows, these should be included within the assessment. Impacts should be assessed on any veteran trees identified through the further survey work. Additionally, it is recommended that ditches be assessed separately.	Yes	Potential effects on mature trees are addressed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) includes additional information about Ancient and Veteran trees.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Paragraph 138 of 8.7.1 acknowledges that habitats created on arable land may be returned to their former land use which would constitute a permanent habitat loss. This is reiterated at section 8.8.8.3 where the adverse effects are considered to be able to range	Yes	The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodology (ES Chapter 2, Environmental Impact

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		from low to high at a Local to County value. NSDC consider that the impacts of decommissioning on habitats have not been thoroughly assessed. NSDC disagree with the notion that the loss of created habitats would represent a neutral effect through reversion back to a value equivalent to the anticipated future baseline value of the site. On balance this might not represent a significant negative impact but should be captured through a revised BNG to be included within the DHP to help ensure that the scheme will continue to contribute to biodiversity conservation throughout its lifespan.		Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**) requires decommissioning effects on be assessed against the current 'do nothing' baseline rather the baseline at the time of decommissioning. This is the approach presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. Woodlands, hedgerows and trees created by the Development will be retained at decommissioning.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Hedgerow translocation is suggested as additional mitigation for species-rich hedgerows, including those that that qualify as 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations, with further information to follow within the outline LEMP. It is recommended that hedgerows considered for translocation are included within the AIA to inform any mitigation plans required.	No	The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**), oCEMP (TA A 5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) and oLEMP (TA A 5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) include consideration of hedgerow translocation.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The PEIR claims that habitats that are temporarily disturbed during construction would be reinstated to the same or better condition. 'Better condition' should be clearly defined, particularly in the context of agricultural land, though it is assumed that this will be reflected within the BNG assessment.	No	An example of 'better' condition includes instances such as the reinstatement of the cable corridor to mitigation/enhancement habitats, rather than to its former arable land use, which would be the 'same' condition. The Outline Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (TA A8.3

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.3]) reflects these assumptions.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Section 8.6.6.2 describes the direct and indirect benefits of the cessation of agriculture, yet much of the low-value intensively cultivated land will be reinstated following decommission. Dependent upon the condition value of the proposed grassland beneath the solar panels, this may represent a significant loss of biodiversity value within the context of the Statutory Biodiversity Metric when replaced with an arable habitat type of lower condition.	Yes	The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodology (ES Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**) requires decommissioning effects on be assessed against the current 'do nothing' baseline rather the baseline at the time of decommissioning. This is the approach presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Assessment of likely significant effects on great crested newts Whilst it is acknowledged that the Order Limits has changed as part of the iterative design process it is considered that there has been insufficient consideration of potential impacts to this species. In addition, Figure A8.7 of TA 8.7 does not include pond number labels, or the results of the presence/ likely absence surveys undertaken in 2022.	Yes	Pond numbers are now shown on Figure A8.7.1. These numbers can be used to cross reference the results of the surveys reported in the Great Crested Newt Baseline (TA A8.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.7]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Section A8.7.2.2 of TA 8.7 indicates that water samples for eDNA surveys were only collected from ponds with a Habitat Suitability Index (HSI) rating of 'Average' or higher. While this approach may seem practical, additional justification is necessary. It is recommended that eDNA surveys be conducted in 2025 for ponds that have not yet been surveyed, including all ponds within the site. This approach could still be proportional by only including ponds within 500m of confirmed Great Crested Newt (GCN) ponds that have not been previously surveyed. Alternatively, the applicant could use the Natural England Rapid	No	The great crested newt survey protocol was agreed with Natural England in 2024. It provides a pragmatic approach to establishing a baseline for assessment and informing likely mitigation and licensing requirements. Post-consent / pre-construction surveys will

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Assessment tool to provide further evidence of potential impacts.		provide a fully up-to-date baseline to inform mitigation and licensing.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Table 8.1 of the PEIR states that the study area may be extended to 500m under certain circumstances, and it is unclear if this has been adopted for the 2024/25 survey work. Table 8.2 of the PEIR also states that HSI and eDNA assessments of 37 ponds were planned for 2024 which previously did not have access. It is considered that an attempt should be made of ponds that were also not previously surveyed due to dry conditions.	No	Clarification of survey areas is provided in TA A8.7: Great Crested Newt Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.7]** . All except one off-site pond within 500 m of the confirmed ponds have been surveyed and only low impact works are expected near to ponds supporting the species. No further surveys have been undertaken, but comprehensive post-consent / pre-construction surveys will provide a fully up-to-date baseline to inform mitigation and licensing.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	A review of the Masterplan (Figure A8.7 of TA 8.7) suggests that there could be fragmentation impacts and potential missed populations in the south-west of the site where ponds between confirmed GCN ponds have been excluded from the assessment based upon a 'poor' HSI score.	Yes	Fragmentation effects are now addressed for great crested newt in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	In our comments on the scoping report, NSDC considered there should be some assessment via targeted survey work for reptiles. The PEIR has confirmed that additional survey work is being undertaken in 2024/25, but this will be via sampling surveys rather than survey of all riparian/bankside habitat within the Site and states no reptiles have been identified to date. Whilst this is likely a proportionate approach, NSDC would expect the ES (or supporting appendix) to provide a rationale and methodology for determining sample size and sample locations. Dependent upon further results, if species other than grass snake are identified it is suggested that reptiles as a species group are scoped in (Table 8.7 Summary of Important Ecological Features within the PEIR)	No	Reptile surveys are reported in TA A8.9 : Other Notable and Protected Species **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.9]** **.** Grass snake remains the reptile scoped into the assessment in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	NSDC consider the survey effort to be proportional and welcome the provision of bat boxes. It is suggested that further detail is provided within the Draft outline CEMP for contingency actions should a bat roost be identified and the provision requirements for compensatory bat boxes to fulfil mitigation requirements and additional boxes provided for enhancement. NSDC recommend that the ES chapter further considers the impact of decommissioning on foraging and commuting bats due to the loss of more suitable habitat that will have established during the operation period and the reversion back to arable land. While further assessment is pending, the draft Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (DRP) should outline mitigation measures.	Yes	The oCEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) includes mitigation for bats. The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodology in ES Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment requires decommissioning effects to be assessed against the current 'do nothing' baseline rather the baseline at the time of decommissioning. This is the approach presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is noted that survey work for otter and water vole is ongoing and that a targeted approach has been taken of suitable waterbodies, contrary to good practice survey methodology with only one survey visit rather than the recommended two. It is unclear in paragraph 29 of section A8.8.2.2.1 of TA 8.8 whether the 2024/25 surveys have also followed this approach or whether two surveys have been undertaken in areas where works and therefore direct impacts have been confirmed within the revised proposals. Whilst NSDC agree that direct impacts to watercourses will be localised and that the above approach is proportional to the likely impacts and suggested mitigation, it is recommended that two surveys are undertaken in areas where works are proposed, and definitive evidence has been found in order to inform any potential mitigation licences required. Figure A8.8.2 displayed water vole survey results up to April 2024. The watercourses labelled 230-W1, 279-W1 and 21-W1 (comprised of The Beck and its tributaries) are hydrologically connected, yet the figure shows sections of the watercourse where water vole is present and others where they are absent. It is considered that	No	Further details about the survey approach are provided in the Otter, Water Vole and White-clawed Crayfish Baseline (TA A8.8 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.8]**). Otter and water vole presence are now assumed, in the assessment of effects in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**, in watercourses connected to one in which the species were confirmed. The current baseline is sufficient to inform the assessment of effects and potential licensing requirements. No further surveys have

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		given the connectivity, if this species has been confirmed within a surveyed stretch, that they are present along the whole of that individual watercourse, in particular watercourse 230- W1.		been undertaken, but comprehensive post-consent / pre-construction surveys will provide a fully up-to-date baseline to inform mitigation and licensing.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is acknowledged that neither the desk study data nor field data have been fully analysed to date. However, the methods section (A8.4.2) within TA 8.4 does not include any assessment details against the LWS selection criteria for Nottinghamshire. As mentioned above and in our comments at the EIA scoping stage, NSDC consider that the site should be assessed against the selection criteria.	Yes	LWS guidelines are now considered in TA A8.4: Breeding Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]** and TA A8.54: Wintering Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Guidance for selecting site boundaries for LWS are provided at section 7.4 of the LWS Handbook Part 113, with specific selection criteria in relation to birds within the LWS Handbook Part 2A5. With the application of these documents, it is considered that the scale of the site should not be a limiting factor to the assessment. As guidance, NSDC suggest that the field groupings	Yes	LWS guidelines are now considered in TA A8.4: Breeding Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]** and TA A8.54: Wintering Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		used for each 'transect section' could form the boundary for the assessment.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	There is inconsistency between Table 8.2 of the PEIR and section 8.4.2.2 of the TA 8.4 regarding the number of breeding bird surveys that have been undertaken.	Yes	Table 8.2 of ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** now includes the correct number of surveys (n = 4).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	It is noted that targeted and species-specific survey are ongoing, including for breeding Schedule- 1 listed raptor species and NSDC look forward to having the opportunity to review the results of these surveys. The PEIR and TA 8.4 are light on the details and locations of these surveys and at this stage NSDC request that a plan of the locations of the ongoing survey work is provided with the ES chapter.	No	Schedule-1 breeding bird survey results are provided in confidential TA A8.11 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.11]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Paragraph 155 of section 8.8.3 of the PEIR states that neither European nightjar nor woodlark have been recorded during the breeding surveys undertaken to date. While NSDC agree that the presence of these species within the site is highly unlikely due to the lack of suitable habitat, the applicant should confirm	No	Dusk bird surveys have not been undertaken, but the bat surveys provided excellent spatial and temporal coverage of the study area and an

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		whether any of the surveys included a dusk survey to support this conclusion. This could also provide a good opportunity to identify owl roosts.		opportunity to record crepuscular and nocturnal species other than bats. Surveys for these species is not considered necessary to support the conclusions about their likely presence.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Section A8.5.2.2 of TA 8.5 states that each winter bird survey transect was surveyed once per month between November and February and that selected transects were surveyed in October and March to provide additional data. The analysis of these surveys described in section A8.5.2.3 included peak counts for each species, with paragraph 22 acknowledging that peak counts within October and March would be lower as a smaller area was surveyed. Paragraph 23 then states that "Data from each individual field group can be taken to identify the number of species identified within each group (species richness) as well as the total number of individual birds recorded. The total number of birds can then be divided by the size of the	Yes	The data have been reanalysed, including new, more intuitive field groupings, and are presented in TA A8.5: Wintering Birds Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.5]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		field group (ha) to calculate the density of birds (birds per hectare) in each group across the survey period." There appears to be no accommodation for the quantitative differences in peak counts due to the difference in surveyed areas within the calculation of the mean peak counts. It is that this omission represents a skewed data set and should be accounted for either through appropriate accommodation of the lower counts or omission of March and October counts. It should also be considered whether the analysis is meaningful given the different flocking characteristics (i.e. flock sizes) of different species.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The provision of beetle banks as part of the embedded mitigation is welcomed as these linear features can also be beneficial in terms of connectivity around the site in addition to enhanced foraging provision for a range of species. These can also help to avoid shading issues and it is recommended that the Game & Wildlife Conservation Trust Guidelines are followed for minimum requirements based on field size. However, it is uncertain whether these features will remain or be lost after decommissioning. If they are lost, this change	No	The proposals for mitigation, compensation and enhancement for birds are outlined in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and expanded in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		should be considered in assessing the effects on the local breeding bird population.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**). Decommissioning effects are assessed in Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Paragraph 8.8.15.3 of the PEIR considers that during decommissioning, habitats and environmental conditions that have improved during the operational period to benefit breeding birds will be returned to their baseline conditions and that this would be a neutral effect. NSDC disagree and are of the opinion that this would represent a negative effect, the magnitude of which will depend on the scale of improvement and provision of additional foraging and breeding opportunities that would be lost. It is recommended that monitoring surveys for breeding birds are undertaken periodically during the operational period, prior to decommissioning to inform any further mitigation required.	No	The Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) methodology in ES Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**) requires decommissioning effects on be assessed against the current 'do nothing' baseline rather the baseline at the time of decommissioning. This is the approach presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Biodiversity **[[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. Operational phase monitoring of birds is set out in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	NSDC support the use of Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) and clear span bridges to avoid temporary habitat loss and note that further detail regarding the operational phase of the development and further assessment of residual impacts from the construction period will be forthcoming within the ES. However, the PEIR states at section 8.5.12.5 that detailed fish surveys are not proposed. NSDC recommend that a specialist contractor is engaged to make a habitat assessment for fish potential at each crossing point, whether for access or cables, and provide further detail for any further mitigation requirements. Although eels are assumed to be present in some watercourses, there is no consideration within the assessment for the potential presence of lamprey which are known to be	Yes	River lamprey is now included in the baseline and scoped into the assessment in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** Further details of watercourse crossings and more detailed fish mitigation, including pre-construction surveys, are included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		present within the River Trent, so this species should be included within the ES chapter.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The draft outline LEMP (TA 5.1) is light on detailed information owing to the evolving design of the proposals. It is expected that the version at submission will provide more information on proposed species to be planted, alongside establishment and long-term management prescriptions. The plan will need to be more robust to maximise the success rate of the establishment of mitigation planting. Climate change has created challenging conditions for plant establishment, with prolonged dry springs and summers and mild and wet winters. NSDC would like to see a LEMP that clearly details the number of visits, the actions to be taken during those visits, the process for replacing lost plants during the establishment period and detailed ongoing long-term management. As the project progresses to the next stage NSDC will be happy to provide further advice on our expectations of the document.	Yes	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) includes further details of monitoring and remedial works.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The aspirations of the project include the creation of areas of species-rich grassland within designated ecological mitigation areas. As most of the site is comprised of arable land, soil testing will be required to ensure grassland creation equivalent to 'other neutral grassland' in 'moderate' condition or higher is viable within proposed locations. This will be important to inform establishment strategies, and any remediation required if phosphate and nitrogen indexes are sub-optimal. Grassland creation will also need to take environmental conditions into account and include a variety of mixes that are shade, drought, and water-logging tolerant mixes. For example, increased surface runoff from the solar panels may need to be considered as will impacts from shading. Soil analysis is mentioned under the floodplain meadow section; however, this is during the monitoring stage rather than pre-commencement.	Yes	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1)** includes details of seed mixes for grassland habitats.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The proposals include an aspiration to create and/or restore coastal floodplain grazing marsh (CFGM). Whilst there are no firm proposals for the target condition of this habitat, NSDC want to highlight the importance of having the right hydrological conditions	No	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1)** includes further details of the proposed management of this

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and challenges that can be presented in targeting 'good' condition. All component ditches would also need to achieve 'good' condition and be in accordance with the Statutory Biodiversity Metric condition assessments15 and this would include maintaining sufficient water levels throughout the year. The LEMP should also specify the donor site for collecting green hay and consider the speed in which it could be distributed across the area as this method of grassland establishment is highly dependent upon timing. Ideally the hay would need to be spread within a matter of hours of collection from the donor site to be effective.		habitat/area. Further details may be developed post-consent.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Sheep grazing is proposed for long-term management of grassland beneath the solar panels. Given the scale of the project and stocking requirements NSDC recommended that the LEMP includes details of alternative management prescriptions for a cutting regime as a contingency should grazing prove to be unfeasible due to unforeseen circumstances. Any cutting prescriptions will also need to take ground conditions into account, particularly within flood zones and carefully consider potential site access issues for machinery in wet conditions.AC	Yes	Sheep grazing is expected to be an effective management technique for the solar PV areas. Grass cutting is maintained as an option and is proposed for other grassland areas, notably those not secured by fencing. Details are provided in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				the oLEMP (TA A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1)** .
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The wildlife boxes and artificial refugia section does not include stand-alone log-piles and it is considered that these would be a simple addition that could easily be created using recycled materials from other habitat management operations within the site.	Yes	Log piles have been included in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Large parts of the site are to comprise retained arable land which will be utilised to provide mitigation for farmland birds such as skylark. It is unclear within the proposals whether there will be full control over this land or whether there will be a degree of flexibility for the landowner and whether these features would remain following decommission. This should be clarified.	No	The Owner/Operator will have control over operations in these areas, which will be delivered in collaboration with landowners. It is assumed that arable land will be returned to landowners upon decommissioning.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Hedgerows are currently lumped under one habitat category, and it is recommended that these are separated into the constituent UKHab categories for management prescriptions, as prescriptions for hedgerows with trees will need to be different to those	Yes	The management described in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) reflects the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		without trees. It is envisioned that this could be a simple amendment with only additional prescriptions separated out for specific hedgerow types		requirements of different habitats and features.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The draft LEMP does not include information on monitoring at this stage. At the time of DCO submission NSDC would expect the LEMP to cover a period of a minimum of 30 years following completion of the development (i.e., in line with current BNG guidance), but ideally to cover the 40-year operational period.	No	Monitoring and reporting schedules are included in the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) and cover both the construction and operation periods.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	NSDC would appreciate the chance to review the draft BNG parameters established for the assessment as the PEIR is light on these details. As highlighted above, the assessment will need to consider and follow the NSDC adopted document concerning 'strategic significance.'	No	The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (TA A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**) has adopted the Council's approach to strategic significance.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Following discussions with the applicant's lead ecologist on 15.01.25, it is understood that baseline data has been collected on watercourses using a targeted approach. It is recommended that this approach aligns with the Modular River Survey	No	River MorPH surveys are reported in the Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (TA A8.13

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		(MoRPh) methodology, ensuring that sufficient samples are taken to cover 20% of each watercourse within the site.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	HDD is proposed under large watercourses such as The Beck. This approach is supported, and impacts should still be assessed as part of the BNG assessment. The upgrade of existing culverts should also be taken into account, in addition to proposed new watercourse crossings. All headwalls and other associated infrastructure should also be captured within the assessment.	No	The ecological effects of watercourse crossings are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and Chapter 9 Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**. Details of watercourse crossings are provided in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The PEIR only briefly mentions habitat condition assessments in relation to the proposed BNG assessment. It is assumed that the baseline size and value of individual trees within the site whether they are free-standing or a component part of hedgerows	No	There are over 13,000 trees within the Order Limits and these have not all been surveyed. The Biodiversity Net

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		that do not meet the UKHab definition of 'hedgerow with trees,' will be documented either as part of or alongside the arboricultural assessment. This ensures that all relevant trees are accounted for in the BNG assessment, providing a comprehensive understanding of the site's baseline biodiversity value		Gain Assessment (TA A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13**]) states any assumptions made about trees and hedgerows.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	There should be consideration of how temporary impacts, such as construction compound areas, are accounted for. Cable corridors are currently shown at a 60m width to provide flexibility post-consent. Given the scale of the project and opportunities for habitat creation, it is our view that as a precaution these areas should be considered as 'lost' and then compensated with new habitat creation. Any earthwork requirements must also be fully evaluated within the assessment in relation to retained hedgerows and trees.	No	The Biodiversity Net Gain Assessment (TA A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**) provides details about assumptions relating to temporary impacts. The 60 m-wide cable corridor (within which works will occupy no more than 30 m) will, in most cases, be reinstated to their former land use and so it is reasonable to classify them as temporary.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	BNG practitioners recognise that the process can sometimes be restrictive, limiting innovative habitat creation and enhancement proposals. Large-scale projects like this offer opportunities for creative biodiversity improvements. While the project's voluntary commitment to achieving at least a measurable 10% BNG is appreciated, NSDC suggest that beyond this 10% gain, habitat creation and management measures should not be solely driven by the aim to achieve a higher percentage gain, as this could hinder innovation. In the district of Newark and Sherwood, NSDC would potentially value proposed biodiversity measures based on their specific merits rather than the BNG percentage they generate, especially beyond the 10% gain. This approach is crucial to ensure that proposed biodiversity measures fully consider local nature conservation priorities	Yes	We support this view and outline our approach (in both the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**) to providing biodiversity benefits beyond those quantified in the Defra metric.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Non-native invasive species have been identified within the site and are included within the CEMP, however section A5.3.11.1.3 does not include key relevant legislation including The Invasive Non-Native Species Regulations 2019 (as amended). The document has a concise section on designated sites and states that no	Yes	The Invasive Non-Native Species Regulations 2019 (as amended) are now cited in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		additional mitigation is proposed beyond measures set out for habitats and species. NSDC consider there should be further detail on measures to prevent and reduce construction and long-term impacts on SSSIs and to on-site and nearby LWS and to make reference to them within other sections of the CEMP where mitigation is relevant.		), which also includes more detailed mitigation.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	There are no details regarding protection fencing for ecological features such as retained woodlands, trees, and hedgerows. It is recommended that once the results of an AIA are available that fencing specifications and other mitigation measures such as the receptor areas for any proposed hedgerow translocations are incorporated into the CEMP.	Yes	Details of protection fencing and hedge translocation are included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) and Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The mitigation measures for GCN outlined at section A5.3.11.4.3 include measures for works to stop and the ECoW to provide advice should GCN be found on site. A pragmatic approach should be taken but NSDC recommend that the CEMP should include contingency	Yes	The oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) has been updated accordingly.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		measures if a licence needs to be sought. It is recommended that details of directional strimming are included for reptiles at section A5.3.11.5.3 as a precautionary working method.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	Paragraph 186 of section A5.3.11.6.1.3 outlines that nesting bird checks must be conducted, and works should commence within two weeks of these surveys. NSDC find this timeframe unacceptable, as many bird species recorded within the site could establish nests within this period. Therefore, nesting bird checks should be carried out no more than 24-48 hours before vegetation removal.	Yes	The oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) has been updated accordingly.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Ecology and biodiversity	The design is evolving with survey work ongoing, and consequently there are some gaps in the information provided. NSDC understand and expect this at this stage of the process, and we have provided feedback accordingly. NSDC trust that the applicant will continue collaborate with relevant stakeholders and interested parties to ensure the eventual DCO submission is thorough and robust from a biodiversity perspective.	No	Consultation has continued since the submission of the PEIR and will continue during all future phases of the Development and planning process.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	Natural England (NE) note and welcome the inclusion of 'Technical Appendix A8.2: Ecology Designated Sites Baseline' which presents desk study data obtained in order to understand the effects of the proposed Development on designated sites. It has been correctly identified that there are two Internationally Designated Sites within 30km of the Order Limits of the proposed development, these being; Birklands and Bilhaugh (SAC) which lies 7.0 km North West and Sherwood Forest ppSPA which is 4.5 km West and North-West.	No	The baseline remains unchanged and is presented in TA A8.2: Ecology Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]**
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE welcome the adoption of a 'risk based approach' for the purposes of this assessment with regards to Sherwood Forest ppSPA, given the site/designation has no formal recognition.	No	The 'risk based approach' has been extended to the inclusion of a Habitats Regulations Assessment Screening Report (document 5.7 **[EN010162/APP/5.7]**).
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	Section 8.8.2 para 152 states that there is no clear ecological pathway between the Development and Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC. Para 152 also correctly identifies that the qualifying features of the SAC i.e. habitats and plants are extremely unlikely to be	No	The assessment of effects on Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC remains unchanged since PEIR and is presented in ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		functionally linked to the Order Limits, as well as there being no direct hydrological links. It also states that the Order Limits are not in the Impact Risk Zone (IRZ) for the Birklands and Bilhaugh SAC. NE concur with this assessment and consider there to be no possible impact pathways from the proposed development to the SAC.		Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	Section 8.8.3, para 155 notes that the two potential qualifying features of Sherwood Forest ppSPA, breeding European Nightjar and Woodlark, have not been recorded during the breeding bird surveys. It also states that the Order Limits does not include sufficiently extensive or well connected (to the ppSPA) areas of suitable breeding habitats (woodland and heathland). Para 156 states that given the specialist habitat requirements and the restricted distribution of these species, it is extremely unlikely that they will depend on or utilise the Order Limits, such that it is not considered to be functionally linked land, concluding that effects will therefore not be significant. NE concurs with this assessment.	No	The assessment of effects on Sherwood Forest ppSPA remains unchanged since PEIR and is presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	It has been correctly identified that the proposed development lies within 5 km of the Order Limits of nine SSSI sites (Site of Special Scientific Interest). The Order Limits of the proposed development crosses several of Natural England's Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) including two which trigger the 'All Planning Applications' development category, namely, Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI and Mather Wood SSSI.	No	The baseline remains unchanged since PEIR and is presented in TA A8.2: Ecology Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]**
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	Section 8.5.2 para 38 states that no other IRZ triggers within the Order Limits include the development category of 'Wind and Solar Energy'. Nonetheless, NE welcome consideration of impacts to Laxton Sykes SSSI due to the potential of direct hydrological connectivity.	No	The baseline remains unchanged since PEIR and is presented in TA A8.2: Ecology Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]** Laxton Sykes remains scoped into the assessment of effects in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	We concur with the decision in Table 8.7 which scopes out the other SSSI's identified within 5km of the Order Limits. This is due to the notified features being very unlikely to be functionally linked or a lack of a clear ecological connectivity between the designated SSSI and the Order Limits.	No	The baseline remains unchanged and is presented in TA A8.2: Ecology Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]** The statutory designated sites scoped out of the assessment of effects in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** remains unchanged since PEIR.
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	Prior discussions between Envams and NE have highlighted an error with the original Order Limits whereby Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI was partly within the Order Limits where the boundary overlaps the unclassified road along the 1.5km southern boundary of the SSSI. We understand that this is an error and the SSSI no longer sits within the Order Limits but will be adjacent.	Yes	The boundary of the Order Limits has been revised to be congruent with the boundary of Earkring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE welcome the consideration of construction impacts upon the Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI as discussed in Section 8.8.4.1 of the PEIR.	No	The assessment effects on Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI remain unchanged since PEIR are presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	It is noted in para 161 that the nearest proposed construction activity to take place to the SSSI will be the construction of passing places. Consideration has been given to maximising separation from the SSSI, however there are potential pathways for effects on the SSSI from dust during construction, as well as hydrological effects that need to be mitigated for. NE advise that the CEMP must include specific measures to mitigate for potential adverse effects from dust pollution and hydrological impact pathways on Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI during these construction activities.	Yes	Additional detail has been included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE note in Section 8.8.4.1 para 162 the potential pathway for construction disturbance to the breeding bird assemblage that are a notified feature of the SSSI. It is stated that the construction of passing places will take place over a short period of time and if undertaken in the breeding season will be a source of low magnitude, temporary aural disturbance to the breeding bird assemblage. NE advise that the construction of passing places should be outside the bird breeding season in order to avoid any disturbance impacts.	Yes	Construction of the passing places adjacent to Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI will take place outside the bird breeding season. This commitment is included in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**).
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE welcome the consideration of operational impacts upon the Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI as discussed in Section 8.8.4.2 of the PEIR. We concur with the assessment that there are no other likely pathways for ecological effects from operational activities. We also note and welcome the beneficial effects on wider habitat enhancement.	No	The baseline remains unchanged since PEIR and is presented in TA A8.2: Ecology Designated Sites Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]** Eakring and Maplebeck

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Meadows SSSI remains scoped into the assessment of effects in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity. The oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) provides details of the nearby habitat management.
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE concur with the assessment of impacts to the Mather Wood SSSI, as outlined in Section 8.8.5 para 172-180 and consider that embedded mitigation and the implementation of the CEMP will reduce the likelihood of effects to the notified features of the SSSI. NE advise that the CEMP should outline specific measures to ensure that any construction work undertaken does not encroach into the SSSI.	Yes	Additional detail has been included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**). The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) includes method statements to safeguard trees and woodland.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE concur with the assessment of impacts to Laxton Sykes SSSI, as outlined in section 8.8.6 para 181-190. The direct hydrological connection via a small stream flowing northwards from the Order Limits to the SSSI has correctly been identified. NE agree that the measures in the CEMP that address pollution prevention and hydrology will mitigate potential adverse effects mediated by surface water. It is acknowledged that unmitigated defects from localised pollution would perhaps be low risk in terms of impacts to the SSSI, however, we still consider the site to be a sensitive receptor and consider the implementation of CEMP measures necessary to avoid adverse impacts. NE are satisfied that no other effects are considered likely.	No	Additional detail about Laxton Sykes SSSI has been included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**).
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE acknowledge Table 8.11 which details a summary of likely effects for the identified designated sites. At each development phase (construction, operation, decommissioning) the significance of effect for Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI, Mather Wood SSSI and Laxton Sykes SSSI are all identified as being 'not significant' and therefore mitigation is classified as 'none required.' NE still consider that a precautionary	Yes	Additional detail about designated sites has been included in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		approach should be adopted to ensure that reasonable and proportionate mitigation measures have been taken in order to avoid or minimise potential adverse impacts from the proposed development on the identified SSSIs. We therefore emphasise the importance of embedded mitigation in the CEMP which should note specific items where there are sensitivities nearby. As stated above, the avoidance of breeding seasons for groundworks adjacent to Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI is required by NE. Without avoidance, further consideration may be required for the possible disturbance to SSSI birds. NE welcome further discussion with the applicant in regards to SSSI sites and are happy to engage with the applicant pre-submission regarding details of the CEMP and any SSSI impact pathways.		
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE generally welcome the approach taken to avoid impacts to protected species and note that the CEcMP has been prepared on the basis of 'reasonable avoidance measures.' At present the applicant assumes that Protected Species mitigation licences from Natural England will not be required.	No	Reasonable avoidance measures continue to be proposed in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	It is acknowledged as per section 8.6.6.4 that the need for and scope of Protected Species licensing will be determined upon the completion of further baseline studies and review of the Development design.	No	Noted.
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	We note in section A5.3.11.1.5 which states that 'licences may be required to facilitate works affecting the following legally protected species: Great crested newt, Bats, Otter, Water vole and Badger.' NE have engaged in discussions with Envams with regards to the need for licencing; where it is considered unlikely that a licence will be required, the process of obtaining a Letter of No Impediment (LoNI) may not be necessary. However, where it is considered likely that any licences may be required, it may be valuable to consider the benefit of LoNIs for the identified species. Whilst obtaining a LoNI is not mandatory, the Planning Inspectorate are likely to question their absence, given the acknowledgement that licences for the above species 'may be required' and at present, there is no indication of the likelihood these licences will/will not be required.	Yes	With the adoption of reasonable avoidance measures (as set out in the oCEMP, TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**), the revised Development design is expected to avoid the need for licences in many scenarios. However, under some scenarios reasonable avoidance measures may not be sufficient or appropriate and so protected species licences are likely to be required. The CEMP (in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				the oCEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) sets out the approach to determining the likely need for and scope of licencing.
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	Whilst it is acknowledged that some survey data may be out of date and/or incomplete prior to submission, a LONI can still be issued based upon the best available data held at the time, with the understanding that pre-construction surveys will be completed post- consent to inform full licence applications.	No	The ecological baseline may change before construction begins and so pre-construction surveys are proposed in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**) to provide an up-to-date baseline to inform mitigation and licensing requirements.
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	Where the need for licences is identified later on in the development process, in the absence of a LoNI, this licence will need to be applied for in the usual manner; Natural England are unable to provide a position on the likelihood of a licence being granted without having	No	The likely need for and scope of licencing is addressed in CEcMP in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		reviewed a draft licence application. 6 It should also be noted that Natural England are unable to comment on the need for a licence, this responsibility falls to the developer		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**).
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	Whilst Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) is not yet mandatory for NSIPs, NE welcome section 8.4.1.5 which states that the proposed development is committed to delivering a gain in Biodiversity Units across habitats, hedgerows and watercourses.	No	The BNG calculation is presented in TA A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	We welcome the allocation of 400 ha of land for mitigation and enhancement purposes. We note the plan to report a BNG assessment in the ES using the Defra Statutory Biodiversity Metric Tool. To enable the Planning Inspectorate, and Secretary of State, to consider the beneficial effects of the project on biodiversity, NE recommend this commitment should be secured within the DCO. Where demonstrated to be feasible through the BNG assessment, NE would also support commitment to greater gains than the minimum 10%.	Yes	The BNG calculation is presented in TA A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**. The BNG totals are 60% for habitats, 26% for hedgerow and 11% for watercourses

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE acknowledge Section 8.4.1.5 para 21 which discusses the ways in which the Development will support and improve biodiversity that are not captured by the metric and are possibly more difficult to quantify, such as supporting the work of local conservation projects. These are welcomed & NE would always support wider actions to improve biodiversity, regardless of their inclusion in the DCO. Whilst our statutory advice is not relevant to these elements, NE will continue to engage via DAS, wherever resource allows, to provide continued involvement with the wider environmental benefits of the project	No	The Development continues to seek ways to support biodiversity and Environmental issues and welcomes Natural England's support.
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	NE note in Section 8.4.1.4 para 18 that a detailed assessment of potential arboricultural impacts has not been provided in the PEIR due to the very large numbers of trees and extensive areas of woodland in the Order Limits.	No	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment is provided in TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**
Natural England	Ecology and biodiversity	We welcome the commitment to further screening post-PEIR for potential arboricultural impacts which will inform the need for and scope of further arboricultural studies. NE refer to our Standing Advice for Ancient Woodland, Ancient Trees and Veteran trees.	No	An Arboricultural Impact Assessment is provided in TA A8.12 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	The masterplan highlights areas where wildlife habitat will be delivered to provide mitigation for loss of habitat elsewhere within the DCO and to achieve Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG). The Development is committed to delivering a gain in Biodiversity Units across habitats, hedgerows and watercourses, and over 400 ha of land has been allocated to mitigation and enhancement. Table 8.9: Relationships between Masterplan and LEMP Habitat Features provides the extents of habitat creation. For example, Proposed Grassland (PV areas) – species diverse will deliver 1587.1 ha of modified grassland. For the proposed ponds and scrapes, the number and location of those features is yet to be determined. Other proposed habitat features are less well developed at this stage: Proposed Wildlife Site (38.2ha); Proposed Green Corridor (2.7ha) and Proposed Riparian Corridor (55.4ha). Details of the specific habitats to be created within these areas aren't provided but we anticipate that agreement will be reached on those habitats during forthcoming steering group meetings of which NWT will be part of. Similarly, we are confident the number of ponds and scrapes will be agreed by the time the DCO is submitted.	No	The oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) provides details about proposed habitat enhancement and creation.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	We think consideration should be given to simplifying the key on the Masterplan. There are several terms for areas subject to ecological enhancement and the colour codes appear indistinct. For example, the target Areas for Ecological Enhancement and the Proposed Wildlife Sites could be amalgamated. We suggest that the term Wildlife Site is changes because it could cause confusion with the term Local Wildlife Site (LWS) that applies to sites of at least county value for wildlife (see below) and replaced with Areas for Ecological Enhancement or Ecological Focus Areas. Similarly, the Proposed Riparian Corridor and Proposed Green Corridor could be amalgamated too. As a guide, the following are considered priority habitats within the Order Limits: Semi-Improved Grassland; Coastal and Floodplain Grazing Marsh; Wood pasture and Parkland; and Deciduous Woodland.	Yes	The key has been simplified to help provide consistency with the UKHab baseline, the BNG assessment, and with priority habitats.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Areas of Ancient and Semi-natural Woodland and Ancient Replanted Woodland are present around the boundary of the Order Limits (none within) and all are designated as LWS. We strongly support the intention to create and enhance 72 ha of habitats (including	No	These proposals remain part of the Development and are described in more detail in the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		potential floodplain meadow and a possible wildlife site) around The Beck, c. 500 m downstream of Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI that will improve landscape connectivity and help to reduce disturbance. Combined with Eakring Meadows LWS, Hunt's Meadow LWS and Kersall Grassland LWS, which are situated between the SSSI a larger and better-connected network of wildlife sites will be created in line with Lawton's principles of bigger, better, more joined up. In turn, this may increase the resilience of the SSSI to external factors (such as climate change) and support its notified features by providing additional resources (e.g. for foraging birds). Crucially, it is stated that these beneficial effects will be permanent and may be significant at the Local level.		oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	We note that valuable hedgerows (e.g., species-rich or 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations) may be translocated to a new location. The success of that approach is uncertain and so translocation of hedges should be a last resort.	No	Proposals for hedgerow mitigation, including translocation, are provided in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and AIA (TA A8.12

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]).
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Table 8.10 Mitigation for the Open Farmland Bird Community provides information on features and their extents. For example, 178 ha of enhanced arable land is proposed. However, the extent of the following interventions is still to be decided: Skylark plots, lapwing Plots, headlands, beetle banks, wild bird feed crop. We look forward to assessing that information at a later stage.	No	The extent of interventions is now presented in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**. However, the precise number of some, such as skylark plots, will depend on the prevailing crop rotation because they will not be created in fallow land.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Supplementary bird feed is to be provided during construction only. The Sustainable Farming Incentive (SFI) provides an option for arable land: AHW2: Supplementary winter bird food whereby landowners can be paid £732 per tonne per year for the duration of three years. We encourage you and the tenant farmers to consider this option.	No	The draft oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** includes supplementary bird feed during construction. The inclusion of overwinter stubbles, beetle banks, and wild bird seed crop

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				will provide overwinter resources during operation.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Converting areas of arable land to grassland will result in the cessation of nitrate and phosphate applications to the land, which is carried out periodically due to current land use. This cessation may lead to less run-off from the land and improve water quality in ditches and water courses. The cessation of nitrate and phosphate applications is to be welcomed due to a positive impact on water quality, but we would like clarification on whether such applications will continue to be applied on the retained agricultural land within the DCO.	Yes	Some application may continue in retained arable land. Clarification is provided in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** and the oLEMP (TA A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	We note that the phasing of the LEMP will allow compensatory habitat for farmland birds to be created before construction activities begin. We support that approach because it will provide higher quality habitat into which birds can be displaced and provide conditions to improve the productivity of the unaffected birds.	No	Noted. The phasing of the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** during construction will be developed post-consent based on the construction programme.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	The Trent and Belvoir Vales National Character Area should be used as a guide for woodland types. Native species, preferably of local provenance stock for all new plantings should be used that are characteristic of the National character Area (NCA). Most hedges in the area are dominated by common hawthorn. To increase the value of the hedges to wildlife, existing and new hedges should be enhanced by the introduction of other shrub species. Variation can be achieved by altering the proportions of species used and future management of the hedges.	Yes	These factors have been considered in the development of the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and additional, local expertise has been provided by the Sherwood Forest Trust.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Many hedges in the solar and biodiversity park are species-poor, gappy and maintained short and narrow. There is an opportunity therefore, to improve the biodiversity value of existing hedges through gapping up with additional species and allowing hedges to grow taller and wider. New hedges would be of value where they improve connectivity between wooded areas.	No	Hedgerow enhancement and creation are key elements of the Development, which will create a net gain in BNG units for this habitat. Further details are included in the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	The Species of Conservation Concern with the highest number of territories within the Order Limits were skylark (n = 346), yellowhammer (n = 221), dunnock (n = 211) and whitethroat (n = 135). The density of skylark territories is approximately 0.13 per hectare in the areas surveyed. 66 Schedule-1 (of the WCA) breeding species included red kite, barn owl, kingfisher, hobby and peregrine. Red kite, kingfisher and peregrine are also Annex-I listed species. The breeding bird survey revealed S41 priority species: yellowhammer, skylark, corn bunting, yellow wagtail, house sparrow and linnet. Publishing the list is a legal duty under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities (NERC) Act. The list is for: • Public bodies- to help them meet their 'biodiversity duty' to be aware of biodiversity conservation in their policy or decision making• Landowners- to inform their nature recovery planning, action and funding applications. All the species are also on the Red List of Birds of Conservation Concern. The species highlighted above require urgent conservation action and so appropriate mitigation is justifiable. The proposed green space may provide foraging	No	Noted. The Breeding Birds Baseline (TA 8.4 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.4]**) provides a comprehensive account of these species. Potential effects on breeding birds are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		opportunities for yellowhammer, house sparrow and linnet but will not provide habitat for ground nesting birds of arable fields (corn bunting, skylark, and yellow wagtail).		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	We understand from discussions with the applicant's ecologist that measures to mitigate for the displacement effects on skylark, yellow wagtail and lapwing from the array sites are being explored. These are likely to consist of implementing management practices on suitable land which have the aim of increasing the carrying capacity to 'absorb' a significant proportion of territories from the site. The following measures are particularly effective. Include spring cereals or a spring break crop (other than oilseed rape, which grows too quickly) in the rotation, where viable. This will provide ideal nesting habitat. Create Skylark plots (small undrilled patches or patches which are sprayed out after crop establishment) in winter cereals to boost nesting success. Weedy overwinter stubbles are the most beneficial winter-feeding habitat for Skylarks on arable farms. The best stubbles are cereal stubbles which receive no pre-harvest glyphosate and no post- harvest herbicides throughout the winter. Can	Yes	These measures have been incorporated into mitigation proposals in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** which are in turn reflected in the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the cultivation of stubbles be delayed going into a spring crop until February or March. Use beetle banks to provide over-wintering habitat for beneficial insects. Beetle banks are two- meter grass strips through the middle of arable fields. Such fields can be managed as one unit, as the headland is still cropped. By implementing such measures, in conjunction with enhanced foraging habitat within the solar arrays, residual effects on these species could be reduced.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	A resident of Ossington contacted NWT to highlight the value of the former Ossington Airfield for nesting skylark and lapwing. Former airfields that are not subject to intensive farming can be attractive to ground nesting bird species. A good example is the former airfield at Newton. We acknowledge that thorough bird surveys have been undertaken, and that suitable mitigation is being proposed for ground nesting birds including skylark within the DCO, but we request that further consideration is given to the deployment of solar panels on the former airfield. That will ensure that an area of notable value for skylark and lapwing is not lost under solar panels. I have provided the note that I was sent for your consideration.	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. The potential effects on them are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Halting grazing in spring (April – June) will favour early flowering plants, whereas summer (July – September) will favour summer flowering plants. Ceasing grazing April – September will provide the greatest biodiversity benefits. A combination of a low stocking density and breaks in grazing should lead to a high diversity of wildflowers and invertebrates as well as benefitting small mammals and foraging birds. A qualified ecologist should assist with the development of a conservation grazing regime that is suited to the site's characteristics and management objectives. The agreed regime should be incorporated into the Biodiversity Management Plan (BMP)/Landscape & Ecological Management Plan (LEMP).	Yes	The grazing regime will vary across the site to balance localised ground conditions, vegetation management and biodiversity benefits. Details are provided in the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	We expect details of cable routes, their installation method, and a full assessment of impacts to be provided. A Cable Route Search Area (CRSA) should be identified that forms the scope of the ecological desk study for the cable route, within which ecological records (notable species and habitats and designated sites) will be searched for. The final location of the cable route elements should be refined by the desk study, supported by ecological survey and	No	The cable route is wholly within the Order Limits and its effects, including on LWS, are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		consideration of responses to statutory consultation, prior to submission of the DCO application. We are concerned about potential adverse impacts on Local Wildlife Sites (LWS).		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	All the main built infrastructure (Work Nos. 1, 4, 5, 6, and 7) has been separated by minimum of 15 m from LWS. Consequently, the only Work Areas that border or include LWS are Work No. 2: Cables; Work No. 3: Mitigation/Enhancement; and Work No. 8: Access Works. Cable and access works involve construction activities, the most likely effects of which include habitat loss and disturbance and direct harm to ecological features, including components of the LWS. All works associated with Work No. 3 will be complementary to the nearest LWS. It is stated that upon completion of construction works associated with Work No. 2: Cables, these areas will be reinstated to their former condition or otherwise used for mitigation and enhancement in line with the specifications for Work No. 3: Mitigation/Enhancement. This mitigation and enhancement will be complementary to the relevant LWS, but it may also target other features	No	Noted. Further details are provided in the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		(e.g., ground-nesting bird mitigation) or serve other purposes (e.g., contributing to BNG).		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	We also note that the CEMP, CEcMP, LEMP and AIA will provide mitigation for most of the likely effects. However, there are five LWS through which cables may need to be routed and so, in the absence of additional mitigation, there is potential for permanent and temporary habitat loss, and harm to their constituent species. Depending on the extent of works and the sensitivity of the features of the LWS, this would be a low to high magnitude adverse effect and significant at the County scale	No	Noted. Assessment of potential effects on LWS is provided in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	We note that most access tracks have been designed to make use of existing gaps in hedgerows and watercourse crossing points. In addition, Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) may be used to avoid sensitive habitats, notably woodlands and watercourses. Hedgerows that may need to be crossed by underground cables will be surveyed to determine their potential to qualify as 'important' under the Hedgerow Regulations, and any 'important hedgerows' will be crossed using HDD.	No	A range of methods will be used to avoid and mitigate potential adverse effects on hedgerows. HDD may not be suitable in some locations (e.g., due to ground conditions) and so alternative solutions would be sought. Hedgerow losses from

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				cabling will be reinstated by replanting or translocation.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Currently the identified cable corridors are broad swathes of land, but it isn't clear what the required working width will be. An example is Maplebeck Viewpoint Verges, a LWS designated for its notable flora. The verges, 600m in length, are to be subjected to Work No. 2: Cables crossing the LWS and a 350 m stretch of Work No. 8: Access Works wholly covers the remainder. Mitigation and restoration are proposed but the extent of the damage and loss to LWS is not clear and we therefore request further information about the cabling process and the LWS that are to be effected.	No	ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** provides the specification of cable and access works. No access works are proposed in Maplebeck Viewpoint Verges LWS. The cable route will pass under the LWS via Horizontal Directional Drilling. Effects on Maplebeck Viewpoint Verges LWS are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Local Wildlife Sites (LWS) are a local, non-statutory designation, below (but complements) the national suite of designated Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). They are of substantive value for the conservation of biodiversity and are home to rare and scarce species or represent the best surviving examples of habitats that were once widespread and typical of the Nottinghamshire landscape. Collectively, these sites form an essential ecological network and act as wildlife corridors and steppingstones, allowing species to migrate and disperse between sites. The continued existence of these sites is vital to safeguard wildlife from the pressures of development, intensive agriculture, and climate change. The LWS network is comprehensive (meaning that every site which qualifies as a LWS is designated as one), whereas SSSIs are representative of the best sites in an area, such that that not all sites which meet the SSSI selection criteria have been, or will be, designated as a SSSI. Because of this, several LWS would potentially qualify as SSSIs, meaning that LWS are best described as sites that are of at least county-level importance for their flora and/or fauna. Every effort	No	Potential effects on LWS are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		should be made, therefore, to ensure that LWS are protected and buffered from development, and this is recognised in Local Planning Policies. The NPPF also specifically cites the need for the protection of irreplaceable habitats		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Measures to minimise construction impacts may include: • Appointment of an ecological clerk of works (ECoW) to provide training and toolbox talks, oversee any activities that could potentially impact biodiversity, be responsible for monitoring and reporting on compliance with planning consents, environmental permits, legislation and mitigation	No	An EnvCoW and ECoW are proposed in the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	• Construction compounds should be in areas of the least nature conservation value.	No	Construction compounds are in agricultural land, a habitat of limited ecological value.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	.Reasonable Avoidance Measures (RAMs) such as covering excavations overnight and ensuring all hazardous materials are correctly stored according to Control of Substances Hazardous to health (COSSH) legislation	No	These measures are specified in the oCEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	The Scoping Report states that the site will be protected with a deer fence. The ES should include information on mitigation measures (such as the use of mammal gates) to avoid significant effects from restricting the movement of species during construction and operation of the proposed development. Consideration should be given to restricting access by mammals to areas that are designed for ground nesting birds	No	Details of the mammal passes incorporated into the fencing are provided in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**. Predator-proofing some areas of ground-nesting bird mitigation may adversely affect other wildlife and so is not proposed but may be considered as part of long-term adaptive management.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	The EcIA should identify where monitoring is required for mitigation, compensation, and enhancement measures. It should set out the methods to be used, the criteria for determining success/failure, appropriate timing, mechanisms for implementation, frequency and duration of monitoring, and frequency of reporting. Monitoring may be used to determine: • whether the	No	Monitoring and remedial actions are described in the oLEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** , which will be secured as a Requirement of the DCO.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		measures have been implemented as agreed • the success/effectiveness of the measures • early warning of proposed measures which are not proving effective • how to remedy the situation should any of the implemented measures fail e.g., due to lack of management. Monitoring should be secured through a planning condition or obligation built into legal agreements.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects are currently exempt from mandatory Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) until an anticipated date of November 2025, and there is not yet any guidance about how statutory BNG will apply to such projects. It is positive to note that In the absence of guidance, and subject to further consultation, a BNG assessment will be reported in the ES using the prevailing Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs (Defra) metric. It is positive to hear that the development is committed to delivering a gain in Biodiversity Units across habitats, hedgerows and watercourses, and over 400 ha of land has been allocated to mitigation and enhancement. This ambitious project represents an opportunity to deliver	No	Noted. A BNG assessment is provided in Technical Appendix A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		habitat creation and enhancement at a significant level and set a benchmark for other solar schemes.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	Reflecting the principles and definitions of the Environment Act 2021, we encourage the applicant to deliver a minimum of 10% net gain in biodiversity so that the biodiversity value of the development exceeds the pre-development on site habitat value by at least 10% but ideally aiming for more. Habitats should be secured for at least the life of the scheme. The mitigation hierarchy still applies of avoidance, mitigation and compensation for biodiversity loss. Appropriate site-specific recommendations will be required for providing enhancements specific for Nottinghamshire BAP species and Section 41 Species and habitats of Principal Importance (NERC Act 2006).	No	Noted. A BNG assessment is provided in Technical Appendix A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Ecology and biodiversity	The particular conditions of the airfield create a rare habitat that cannot be replicated anywhere in the vicinity and certainly not within the site area of the GNRSP. The developers now call the scheme a Solar and Biodiversity Park and have worked hard at creating an overall scheme where biodiversity is an important element, but it appears that the airfield has been completely overlooked as an amazing habitat	No	A range of baseline studies has been undertaken to establish the status and distribution of ecological features in this area. The potential effects on them, and to Laxton

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		both in its own right and due to its position within the zones of impact on the extensive and important Laxton SSSI and next to Ancient Woodland.		Sykes SSSI, are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
North Muskham Parish Council	General feedback	The inclusion of a footpath from Cromwell to Muskham on the east side of the East Coast Main Line (ECML) and/or some form of 'in field' path to avoid walking along the badly sited road leading to the Cromwell Crossing would provide a much safer option than that currently proposed.	Yes	This response has been noted and taken into consideration in the footpath design
North Muskham Parish Council	General feedback	A submission by Dr John Gray sent to Elena Sarieva and others dated 10th February 2025 is included as an Annex A to this correspondence. This provides suggestions as to how a safe, enjoyable and convenient route might be achieved. The Parish Council would ask that this is seriously considered.	Yes	This response has been noted and taken into consideration in the footpath design
North Muskham Parish Council	General feedback	Despite their simple composition, solar panels can contain trace amounts of hazardous materials. However, since the materials are contained within the solar panel itself, most people will not have direct contact with them, but consideration needs to be given to maintaining damaged panels which can be on a	No	ES Chapter 10, Ground Conditions **[EN010162/APP/6.2.10]** and Chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		large scale as recent storms have confirmed. Broken solar panels and other debris would be scattered throughout a wide area. The resulting smoke from solar panels could contain toxic metals and be inhaled by the nearby community. These toxic materials could harm the digestive, reproductive, and nervous systems. It is believed that Solar Farm Industry insiders state that Cadmium is a particular toxic waste problem.		deal assess the risks associated with winds and weather for the resilience of the Solar Farm. The vast majority of Solar Panels in use today are made from Silicon and do not contain Cadmium.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	General feedback	Field 577 and 153 should be removed because of the adverse impact on accessibility through these single/narrow track roads which was the location of a recent fatal collision between a vehicle and a cyclist less than 50m from the fields entrance.	Yes	Traffic and Transport, Chapter 8 references the assessment of these roads **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** Field 577 is no longer planned as a PV field, although field 153 remains

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	In compensation, the occupant suggested panelling could take place in fields 233 and 94, large areas which are likely to be Grade 3b or 4. He has photographic evidence of failing crops there. This move would also slightly reduce the adverse residential amenity impact on the property.	Yes	Panels have been removed from part of field 98 without the need to replace them in fields 233 and 94, see Works Plans **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.1]** The Design Approach Document is at **[EN010162/APP/5.6]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	The Applicant does not intend to complete any ALC work on the suggested fields due to their current intended use. The suggested field swap has been ignored so far. However, when the ALC results finally are published and if field 98 is confirmed at Grade 3a, the Applicant will need to demonstrate that the move is impossible as opposed to too much trouble.	Yes	Panels have been removed from part of field 98 without the need to replace them in fields 233 and 94, see Works Plans **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.1]** and Design Approach Document **[EN010162/APP/5.6]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				And Agricultural Land Chapter 17 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	The Council accept that design details will still be being progressed and it is understandable that final specifications may not be available, even at the time of ES submission. This is catered for by applying the Rochdale Envelope process.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	It could of course also mean that, given what has happened to Tata's Port Talbot blast furnaces, discussions may be with Tata Steel Netherlands. Clearly if the framework could be manufactured in the Netherlands, that would reduce the CO2 transport emissions significantly. This is recognised in paragraph 77 of Chapter 15. However, this paragraph mentioners sourcing steel from UK suppliers, not manufacturers.	No	It is expected, but not yet commercially agreed, that the steel would be provided by UK manufacturers making their steel using arc furnaces. Because of the lack of certainty, ES Chapter 15 Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]** takes a worst-case approach and assumes that the steel will be sourced from China.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	Whilst it accepted that Anglesey is more likely to experience worse storm effects than Nottinghamshire, the Anglesey development was new and suffered damage very quickly in its lifetime (after two years of operation). It would be a brave assertion to assume no similar or worse storm will hit this county in the next 40 years.	No	The Development will be designed such that it can withstand storms predicted in future climate scenarios, by modelling the wind uplift force on the panels and ensuring that the mounting poles are driven in until they can resist such force (using a push-pull test).
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	The Applicant seeks to rely on commentary made by the Solar Energy Industries Association. This organisation is the trade body for solar generators in the USA and is largely funded by them. One of its key stated aims is to promote the growth of solar power. It states it is the voice of the solar industry.	No	Noted. It is common for trade bodies to be funded by their industries, but this does not undermine evidence used by such bodies
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	The Applicant is currently not under any obligation to assess this type of impact as it has been scoped out by the Planning Inspectorate.	No	The Development will be designed such that it can withstand storms predicted in future climate scenarios, by

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				modelling the wind uplift force on the panels and ensuring that the mounting poles are driven in until they can resist such force (using a push-pull test).
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	To the Applicant's credit, they do address the threat of wind damage in Table 15.9 of Chapter 15. Their mitigation measure (which was a requirement in the PINs scoping opinion) to prevent the sort of damage as above is to design the PV modules to withstand modelled maximum forces.	No	The Development will be designed such that it can withstand storms predicted in future climate scenarios, by modelling the wind uplift force on the panels and ensuring that the mounting poles are driven in until they can resist such force (using a push-pull test).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	The Anglesey development was designed by Lightsource BP- a company with experience of building solar farms. It would be very surprising if they had not also attempted the same exercise. This Applicant, whilst rightly asserting that the likelihood of an increase in storm intensity and frequency will increase throughout this century, judges the consequences of wind damage to the panels as 'minimal'.	No	The Development will be designed such that it can withstand storms predicted in future climate scenarios, by modelling the wind uplift force on the panels and ensuring that the mounting poles are driven in until they can resist such force (using a push-pull test). It is fair to acknowledge windier conditions on Anglesey.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	Given this potential threat, the Council hope the Applicant would include an assessment for potential eco-toxicity as one factor affecting panel choice.	No	The active part of a solar panel is encapsulated in a material that prevents its exposure to air or water, for its own protection. Even when a panel is broken, the active part will still be almost entirely

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				encapsulated. The Development will be designed such that it can withstand storms predicted in future climate scenarios, by modelling the wind uplift force on the panels and ensuring that the mounting poles are driven in until they can resist such force (using a push-pull test). If panels were broken, by vandalism or some other cause, this would be detected by monitoring of the performance of the arrays and site operatives would clear up any broken panels and arrange for their replacement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	It is hoped that Section A5.5.2.5 of Appendix TA A05 entitled 'Provision for Storm Events' can include a contingency plan to deal with a worst case wind event. At the moment, it just addresses rainfall.	No	The ES TA A5.5, Outline Operational Environmental Management Plan (oOEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]** , addresses the principal environmental concerns of the Development during the operational phase. Broken panels from any cause would be an operational concern, but not a principal environmental concern, and would be addressed by normal operational management.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	it would be useful to learn from the ES exactly what are the details of the inputs from Sherwood Forest Trust. Is it intended that they would be 'boots on the ground'?	No	The details of Sherwood Forest Trust's partnership and involvement are confidential, but they are

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				providing advice about the landscape design and oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) and it is anticipated that they will supply trees and labour for the tree planting and woodland creation.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	This proposed development differs from the majority of solar plant designs in that it is not one area of contiguous fields, but a number of islands of land connected by fields which will be used for underground cabling.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	Deer fencing is much easier to breach. The Council would welcome a summary in the ES of any discussions regarding security between the Applicant and Nottinghamshire Police and their Design Out Crime Officers.	No	CCTV, fencing will be installed as well as on-site presence to deter this.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	During the operational phase, the Applicant intends to rely on CCTV, movement sensors and lighting as security measures. It is not clear whether the CCTV will be real time monitored or whether it will just be post event recording reviews, in the event of any site incursion. If real time monitoring is planned, it would be useful to learn what the planned response would be to any incursion. It is recognised that, depending on what the answers are to the above questions, any response may need to be submitted as a confidential report.	No	This is a matter for the detailed design stage and it is quite right to suggest this should be kept confidential.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	The Council note the submission of the Outline Fire Safety Management Plan.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	This consultation response is not the appropriate vehicle to discuss the full arguments for and against a BESS. That will no doubt come in due course.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	One such disadvantage could be the furtherance and support of modern slavery internationally.	No	The Applicant has a Modern Slavery Statement and is a signatory of SEUKs declaration on this matter as detailed in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	Fortunately, Elements Green Ltd state they are one such company. They have stated publicly that they have a current Modern Slavery Statement.	No	The Applicant has a Modern Slavery Statement and is a signatory of SEUKs declaration on this matter as detailed in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	The Applicant, having verbally stated that they will probably source the PV panels from Xinjiang in China, is invited on a voluntary basis to include in the DCO a requirement that the panels for this development will not be bought from any company listed in Section	No	The Applicant has a Modern Slavery Statement and is a signatory of SEUKs declaration on this

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		2(d)(2)9(B)(i) or 2(d)(2)9(B)(ii) of the UFLPA Entity List, or any equivalent succeeding list. By doing so, they would affirm their commitments as at 16.33 above.		matter as detailed in ES Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	Because the PEIR by its nature is provisional and some work streams are incomplete, it was to be expected that there was going to be significantly less detail than will probably accompany the ES.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	General feedback	there are significant gaps in the information supplied which make developing an evidenced based argument in favour of a plan change very difficult. For that reason, some of the Council's observations have not been included in this document. It is anticipated they will have to be advanced during the examination stage.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	General feedback	Provision for fire-fighting water, how much, where, access	No	Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the ES Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				(FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	General feedback	The development is far too large and with no discernible evidence of there being any reduction in size despite many responses to the previous consultation objecting to the size.	No	The design evolution of the Development is set out in the ES Chapter 4 Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	General feedback	Carlton-on-Trent Parish Council would not be able to support this application unless significant changes are made to the current consultation proposal.	No	Noted.
GTC	General feedback	If you believe that the proposed area will have an impact on our network, please submit your C2/C3 diversion request along with a copy of this letter/email to Network_Variations@gtc-uk.co.uk.	No	The Development is not expected to affect the GTC network.
GTC	General feedback	If this is for an electric only network, please send to electricity.diversions@gtc-uk.co.uk	No	The Development is not expected to affect the GTC network.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GTC	General feedback	The following must be submitted in order for us to escalate this to our design team. An outline of your proposed works. Highlighted GTC drawing with the area in question.	No	The Development is not expected to affect the GTC network.
RWE	General feedback	The Proposed Development includes parts of Staythorpe Power Station site within its Order Limits and the Applicant does not have any legal rights over the land. RWE considers that the Proposed Development and the powers sought over its land in the Applicant's draft DCO will cause serious detriment to its statutory undertaking.	No	The Applicant has established that it does not need development consent for any works for the purposes of using the wharf at Staythorpe Power Station to transport and unload construction equipment and material via the river. This land has therefore been removed from the Order Limits. The Applicant is in advanced discussions
		The Preliminary Environmental Information Report dated November 2024 included in the Statutory Consultation shows Order Limits for the Proposed Development which have been extended compared to those included in the Applicant's Preliminary Masterplan dated 16 January 2024. In particular, the Order Limits now encompass parts of the Staythorpe Power Station site in order 'to allow the option of transporting equipment and construction materials via		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the river' (identified within Works No. 8 – Access Works).		with RWE for a commercial agreement to use the wharf for these purposes.
		Access Works also indicate that an area currently used by RWE as a contractor village (offices, welfare facilities), laydown compound/contractor parking at Figure 1 - Proposed Development Red Line Boundary Staythorpe Power Station (outlined red in Figure 1) is also included within the Order Limits.		
		Although it is not clear from the Statutory Consultation documents, the Applicant appears to be seeking powers to use this entire area for works and activities associated with the Access Works, such as temporary storage of materials prior to onward delivery to the main development areas, temporary facilities (construction laydown, areas of hardstanding, carparking and site office and welfare facilities) and associated preparatory/reinstatement works.		
		It is not clear whether any RWE-owned land will be affected by the Applicant seeking to provide Biodiversity Net Gain for the Proposed Development.		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Minor alterations to the local transport network to facilitate vehicular access to the main development site.		
		RWE also notes that Article 22 and Schedule 8 of the Applicant's Draft DCO refers to rights that may be acquired over land and restrictive covenants that may be imposed		
		RWE is very unclear which of these rights or restrictions may be sought by the Applicant over RWE's landholding included in the Order Land.		
		Similarly, RWE is unclear to what extent the Applicant may be seeking the powers described in Article 39 and Schedule 10 in relation to temporary possession for construction access and temporary working areas and construction compounds.		
		Any compulsory acquisition or temporary possession powers sought over Staythorpe Power Station site would be highly detrimental.		
		The Applicant has included draft protective provisions for electricity undertakers in Schedule 13 of the Draft DCO. These are most unsuitable to protect RWE's operational requirements at Staythorpe Power Station		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and the Carbon Capture Proposals on its operational land.		
		They are strictly limited to protections for electrical apparatus and inappropriate. RWE's assumption is that the Applicant has not yet considered protective provisions which would be appropriate to protect RWE's operations and proposals.		
		The land area outlined red in Figure 1 within the Staythorpe Power Station site is essential to accommodate existing contract staff and equipment during day-to-day operation of the power station, as well as during periods of major overhaul or major/annual maintenance on each of the four generating units at the power station. During such events this land is used for staff and contractors' accommodation, parking, equipment, and component storage.		
		Planned major outages are programmed and the relevant contractors procured many months in advance, and cannot then be altered.		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Unplanned outages by their very nature will require action to be taken by RWE urgently and in a very short timescale. During these periods, the number of additional staff and contractors is typically several hundred, working 24 hours a day 7 days a week for several months at a time, taking up the full area of the land outlined in red in Figure 1.		
		Consequently, this land within the Staythorpe Power Station site must remain available to RWE at all times, for the station to be operated and maintained, both on a day-to-day basis and for planned and unplanned major overhaul and major maintenance works.		
		Should the land become unavailable for such use, even if temporarily, the power station could experience delays in being returned to service from both planned and unplanned works. This presents a potential risk to security of supply to the UK National Grid whilst also resulting in a large economic impact to RWE's undertaking.		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		In addition, a large proportion of that land falls within Staythorpe Environmental Permit boundary, and it is RWE's responsibility as the operator under that permit to ensure full compliance with the site permit conditions. The Statutory Consultation documentation does not contain sufficient information to enable an understanding of the full proposed use of RWE's land to enable permit control measures to be considered.		
		It is however clear to RWE there is the potential for the Applicant's activities to interfere with or lead to a breach of RWE's obligations under the permit.		
		The roads outlined in red in Figure 1 are the primary access routes used by RWE to Staythorpe Power Station, and include the Staythorpe Road adopted highway and private access routes within RWE's landholding giving essential access to the main power station and ancillary areas. As such, RWE requires unrestricted 24/7 access via those roads		
		As part of RWE's ambition to be net zero by 2040, and in line with the UK Government's aim to achieve clean power by 2030, RWE is furthering its statutory undertaking by developing a carbon capture retrofit		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		project at Staythorpe (the Staythorpe Carbon Capture Plant).		
		RWE are actively progressing the planning consent for this development, by way of a variation to the existing Section 36 consent for Staythorpe Power Station, expected to be submitted around Q3 2025.		
		A scoping opinion for the Staythorpe Carbon Capture Plant was issued by the Secretary of State in July 2024 and RWE is currently consulting on the proposals.		
		The retrofit of carbon capture technology to Staythorpe Power Station requires substantial items of plant and apparatus to be installed immediately adjacent to the existing power station. This equipment would be delivered by road and river utilising the Heavy Lifting Platform ('HLP') adjacent to the River Trent. The installation of the carbon capture equipment would be located on the east of the power station site, in the area hatched blue in Figure 3. That area substantially overlaps with the Order Limits of the Proposed Development.		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Consequently, being unable to utilise this area of land to its fullest extent would prevent RWE being able to deliver its Carbon Capture Plant at Staythorpe and enable decarbonisation in line with RWE's and the UK Government's goals.		
		There is also the potential that RWE's land would become sterilised for use of other development projects relating to its statutory undertaking.		
		RWE has a large electricity generation portfolio and regularly reviews available land and project development options for security of supply or other technologies consistent with Net Zero.		
		RWE has granted a lease of the HLP to National Grid Electricity Transmission plc ("National Grid") and must comply with its obligations as landlord under that lease.		
		These include permitting access over site roads for normal and abnormal loads. National Grid needs to be able to use these access roads at short notice if necessary to ensure that the substation adjacent to RWE's land is able to continue to operate. RWE must ensure the safety of and access to any user of the roads, including National Grid.		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		The Applicant held discussions with RWE for temporary access rights in 2022, with draft Option/access easement documentation having been last exchanged in June 2023.		
		RWE later became aware that the Applicant also sought temporary use of RWE's heavy lift platform and was subsequently contacted as a landlord by National Grid regarding the Applicant's possible use of the HLP.		
		The last substantive contact with the Applicant was when RWE sought further detail regarding the Applicant's proposed use of the HLP in October 2024, and did not receive a response.		
		Throughout this time, the Applicant did not indicate that they required any use of land other than the access road across RWE's landholding and the HLP. Neither the Applicant nor its agents or lawyers have discussed the possible use of any of RWE's land for laydown or construction areas, or road works or any other use. Had the Applicant raised these matters with RWE, we would have be able to provide information on our operational requirements for that land during outages and our proposals for the Staythorpe Carbon Capture Plant		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Engagement from the Applicant regarding the Proposed Development requirements on RWE's landholding and operational site (part of our statutory undertaking) has been poor.		
		Whilst RWE accepts that the Statutory Consultation is a form of engagement with it, RWE does not consider that that alone is adequate.		
		RWE is still unclear at this stage and from the Statutory Consultation documents whether there will be any road works on the roads within RWE's landholding		
		Or interference with RWE's or National Grid's access, or any works on RWE's HLF interfering with our operational use of that facility and with our obligations as landlord to National Grid, or what the entirety of Works Area 8 is required for.		
		This lack of reasonable information demonstrates the inadequacy of this Statutory Consultation in that RWE is not able to make informed comments about the Proposed Development.		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		The inclusion of RWE's land within the Order Limits and potential interference with RWE's operational requirements for Staythorpe Power Station and RWE's Carbon Capture Plant is not only premature but also follows a lack of proper and sufficient engagement with RWE.		
		RWE therefore strongly requests that the Applicant fully and properly engages with RWE in relation to any access or heavy lifting required for the Proposed Development, prior to carrying out any subsequent consultation and prior to submitting the DCO application.		
		RWE considers that with appropriate engagement and details from the Applicant, suitable agreement over the required rights and RWE's undertaking protection may be possible, but the full details of what the Applicant seeks will need to be considered.		
		Any proposed use of the land and in particular any acquisition or possession of land or acquisition of rights in land of RWE's landholding would cause serious detriment to RWE's undertaking at Staythorpe Power Station.		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		RWE has no alternative but to object to the Proposed Development were the Applicant to seek powers over RWE's landholding without RWE's consent, as appears to be suggested by the Statutory Consultation materials.		
		RWE considers that its land should be removed entirely from the Order Land.		
		RWE also considers that appropriate mitigation measures as well as bespoke Protective Provisions for its statutory undertaking should be secured in the DCO, to ensure that Staythorpe Power Station can continue to operate unfettered, and that the Staythorpe Carbon Capture Plant can be built and operated. Without such Protective Provisions there will be serious detriment posed by the Proposed Development.		
		RWE expects the Applicant to provide draft bespoke protective provisions for its consideration, to enable these to be progressed in advance of submission of the DCO application.		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		RWE will be an interested party to the DCO process and would like to be kept notified of the progress of the Proposed Development by email and by post (in addition to the engagement sought specifically in relation to the matters noted above).		
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	Whilst the PEIR identifies the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan as part of the Development Plan Framework for the proposal area (though is absent from the list in paragraph 23 in Chapter 6 – Planning Policy, Volume 2), it does not identify nor consider the policies of the: • Saved Policies from the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Local Plan (adopted 2002) • Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Core Strategy (adopted 2013)	Yes	The outlined policy documents have been discussed in the Planning Statement **[EN010162/APP/5.5]** and ES Chapter 6, Planning Policy **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**.
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	The County Council welcomes publication of the draft DCO at this early stage within the process.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	With respect to the Requirements at Schedule 2, it is recognised that Nottinghamshire County Council is the "county authority" with responsibility for discharging certain requirements. This should only be the case where the requirement relates to an area of statutory responsibility or expertise and it is agreed that Newark and Sherwood will be the default "planning authority" with responsibility for discharging the majority of the requirements, in consultation with other consultees as necessary.	Yes	This is noted and has been reviewed for consistency in the submission version.
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	Requirement 7: Fire Safety Management – the principle of this requirement is agreed but there is a discrepancy with respect to the discharging authority. Part (1) requires the BFSMP to be submitted to the planning authority. However, Part (5) states that the county authority must consult with the Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service and the Environment Agency before determining an application for approval of the BFSMP. It is agreed that the county authority should have responsibility for discharging this requirement in conjunction with NFRS.	Yes	This is noted, and has been reviewed for consistency in the submission version

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	Requirement 10: Surface and Foul Water Drainage – it is noted that this requirement will be approved by the planning authority. However, Part (1) also states that such approval will be in consultation with the planning authority. This should read that such approval is to be in consultation with the county authority (as LLFA), as well as the ITB and Severn Trent Water.	Yes	This is noted, and has been reviewed for consistency in the submission version
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	Requirement 11: Archaeology - the archaeological mitigation strategy should be submitted to and approved by the county authority rather than the planning authority. The county authority is providing advice on archaeology with respect to this proposal, as per comments in this letter.	Yes	This is noted, and has been reviewed for consistency in the submission version
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	Requirement 14: Construction Traffic Management Plan – it is agreed that the county authority should have responsibility for discharging this requirement as Local Highway Authority	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	Requirement 21: Public Rights of Way - it is agreed that the county authority should have responsibility for discharging this requirement as the Local Highway Authority.	No	Requirement 21 no longer included; PRoWs now included in the Recreational Routes Management Plan

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				(requirement 18), which contains details not solely restricted to PRoWs. As such, this is currently drafted to be discharged by NSDC
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	With respect to the Procedure for Discharge at Schedule 14, it is requested that for applications made under provisions of the order, the period for decision should be 13 weeks, rather than 56 days as currently proposed. This was the period agreed for the recently made Cottam Solar Project Order.	No	The Applicant considers 13 weeks to be excessive, and it is noted that recently approved DCOs, such as The East Yorkshire Solar Farm Order 2025, have included an 8-week determination period. However, the Applicant appreciates that a balance needs to be struck and so has provided for 10 weeks, which was the period agreed in The West

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Burton Solar Project Order 2025.
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	The County Council reserves the right to make further comment on the content of the draft DCO as the project progresses, especially in relation to PART 3 STREETS. Further engagement with the County Council is recommended prior to submission of the draft DCO to the Examining Authority.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	General feedback	It should be noted that whilst a DCO can include power to interfere with highways, those works should still be subject to a permit obtained from the highway authority under the Streetworks Permit Scheme and the Council would seek to ensure that this provision is included within the submitted DCO.	No	The Applicant has applied the Nottinghamshire Permit Scheme with modifications, as set out in article 10 of the draft DCO. This is in accordance with the Tillbridge Solar Project DCO application.
National Fire Chiefs Council	General feedback	Lack of sufficient water supplies at a particular site location should not be considered as the basis for a suppression system choice. Such an approach could result in potentially ineffective and/or dangerous system designs.	No	The firefighting strategy will include cooling nearby enclosures using on-site water supply, with two 231m3 water

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				tanks providing 1,900 LPM for at least 2 hours, meeting NFRS, NFPA 855, and ARC requirements. This strategy complies with local water management and safety regulations, ensuring a robust firefighting capability.
The Coal Authority	General feedback	We have reviewed the site location plan provided and can confirm that the site falls within the Coal Authority's defined Development Low Risk Area. On this basis we have no specific comments to make. However, in the interest of public safety, it is requested that the Coal Authority's Standing Advice note is drawn to the applicant's attention, where relevant.	No	Noted.
Health and Safety Executive	General feedback	HSE's Land Use Planning advice is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present within HSE's land-use planning zones. As the project area 'redline' is not within any of HSE's land-use planning zones, under HSE's existing policy for providing land-use planning	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		advice, HSE would not advise against the development. HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted		
National Highways	General feedback	National Highways has a standard set of protective provisions which we require to be secured on the face of the DCO. We encourage Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park to engage early with us on these and to any changes to these protective provisions should be agreed within a Side Agreement with National Highways.	No	The draft DCO contains protective provisions for the benefit of National Highways at Part 5 of Schedule 13. If required, the Applicant will progress discussions with NH to consider further tailored provision
NATS Safeguarding	General feedback	The proposed development has been examined from a technical safeguarding aspect and does not conflict with our safeguarding criteria. Accordingly, NATS (En Route) Public Limited Company ("NERL") has no safeguarding objection to the proposal. However, please be aware that this response applies specifically to the above consultation and only reflects the position of NATS (that is responsible for the management of en	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		route air traffic) based on the information supplied at the time of this application. This letter does not provide any indication of the position of any other party, whether they be an airport, airspace user or otherwise. It remains your responsibility to ensure that all the appropriate consultees are properly consulted.		
North Lincolnshire Council	General feedback	I can confirm that after consultation with our internal technical consultees that North Lincolnshire Council has no comments or objections to raise in respect of this project with the proposed development not likely to result in any significant impact upon North Lincolnshire.	No	Noted.
Canal & River Trust	General feedback	As commented in our Phase 1 Scoping response dated 1 December 2023, the red line boundary of the project is separated from our assets by both the A1 and the existing railway alignments. The Trust does not own or manage the non-navigation parts of the River Trent closest to the project between Averham and South Muskham, which are the closest part of the wider river corridor to the red line boundary of the project. As a result, impacts for the Trust remain as stated previously, namely limited to long distance views and the routing of construction traffic to access the development site.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Maplebeck Parish Council	General feedback	It was a unanimous agreement that all residents felt the proposed Great north Road development was too large.	No	Noted.
Maplebeck Parish Council	General feedback	Brendan Carson explained his involvement with the JPAG. (Joint Parish Action Group) which was formed to try and fight the current proposal. He explained that the current government target of 70 Gw could be met using less than 1 % of Uk land mass but existing the GNR development alone would occupy over 4 % of the Newark and Sherwood area showing the proposed development is disproportionately large for our district.	No	As set out in the ES Technical Appendix A5.6, Design Approach Document **[EN010162/APP/5.6],** there is particular need for the Development to be here, as a result of the availability of the grid connection, which is not the case in most districts.
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	General feedback	We are just one of a large number of parishes in the Newark and Sherwood district that feel overwhelmed by the planned and proposed solar and BESS installations for our area. This could amount to 6.5% of our district and 12.5% of our farmland being consumed by renewable energy projects.	No	Developments to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment are identified in ES chapter 2, Environmental Impact

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]** Technical Appendix A2.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** . The cumulative effects of these developments are then assessed in the respective ES chapters.
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	General feedback	We will be surrounded by an industrial landscape of solar and battery installations and no amount of biodiversity, landscaping or NG+ funding will mitigate the impact this will have on the local population and the wider area. We already have the industrial locations of the Staythorpe Power Station and its future development of carbon capture, the National Grid Substation alongside the sugar beet factory. There comes a time when the cumulative effect of such industrial development in a relatively small area must be challenged and a cut off point is reached.	No	Developments to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment are identified in ES chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]** Technical Appendix A2.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** . The cumulative effects of these developments are then assessed in the respective ES chapters.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	General feedback	As a Parish Council we object to the current design and plans for this development.	No	Noted.
Joint Nature Conservation Committee (NJCC)	General feedback	This development proposal is not located within the offshore area, does not have any potential offshore nature conservation issues and is not concerned with nature conservation at a UK-level, therefore JNCC does not have any comments to make on the consultation.	No	Noted.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	General feedback	we object to and do not support the planned Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park.	No	Noted.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	General feedback	Any changes to the proposal, especially those mentioned above, would be welcome however we reserve our further judgement and maintain our objection to the GNR Solar and Biodiversity Park.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	General feedback	We note that under Principal Powers – Application and modification of statutory provisions Part 8 (h), you have signalled that "regulation 12 (requirement for environmental permit) of the Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016(c) in respect of a flood risk activity only" should not apply to your development. We recognize this as a wish to disapply Flood Risk Activity Permits (FRAPs) for your scheme. We cannot agree to disapplication until you have agreed protective provisions for FRAPs by consulting with ourselves. We will contact you separately to share our standard protective provisions wording, and an explanatory note. For our disapplication discussions, we will require a list of all the flood risk related activities you wish to disapply, and any detailed drawings relating to structures you propose to build over or under a main river. Once we have provided agreement that you can disapply FRAPs, you may insert the relevant wording from the "Environment Agency Standard Protective Provisions –January 2025" into your draft DCO, within Schedule 13.	Yes	There is no wish to disapply any part of the Environmental Permitting Regulations, and this is corrected in the draft DCO in the application submission.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	General feedback	We have a leasehold interest for the siting of rain gauging equipment at Staythorpe Power Station (His Majesty Land Registry Title: NT384137). National Grid owns this land. We need to ensure that the proposed development allows for the continued operation of the site, or that the applicant provides a suitable alternative location for the apparatus at their expense. Continued operation of the site would include ensuring continuous supply of main powers, and ensuring that any development doesn't interfere with the function of the rain gauging equipment. Please engage with ourselves as soon as possible, so that we can discuss your intentions for this area of land.	Yes	This parcel of land now sits outside the Order Limits.
Environment Agency	General feedback	Changes to rights of way need to ensure that they do not impede our access to this land parcel, and the operation of the rain gauge. Your access to works approach needs to ensure that there is no impediment of our access to this land parcel, and the operation of the rain gauge	Yes	There are no proposed rights of way changes that would impede access into this area of land and the land now sits outside of the Order Limits.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	General feedback	Schedule 9 (Modification of Compensation and Compulsory Purchase Enactments for the Creation of New Rights and Imposition of New Restrictive Covenants) Please discuss with ourselves any intention to modify our leasehold over the land.	Yes	This land now sits outside the Order Limits.
Environment Agency	General feedback	Schedule 13 Protective Provisions and Part 1 and Part 3 Part 1 We note that we are not listed under this section. Part 3 We note that this section is listed as "TBC". We request that we are considered in this section, and that equipment on the parcel of land is accommodated for or located elsewhere	Yes	This land now sits outside the Order Limits.
Environment Agency	General feedback	Schedule 2 Requirements. In regards to requirement 16 Ground conditions, we request that the wording is amended to the following:• Unsuspected contamination 1) In the event that contaminated land is found at any time when carrying out the authorised development, which was not previously identified in the environmental statement, then no further development (unless otherwise approved in writing by the relevant authorities) shall be carried out within the identifiable perimeters of the area in which the suspected contamination is located. It must be reported as soon	No	The DCO contains Req 16, of which clause 2 states: If, during the carrying out of the authorised development, contamination not previously identified is found to be present no further development (unless otherwise

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		as reasonably practicable to the local planning authority, and where necessary, the Environment Agency, and the undertaker must complete a risk assessment of the contamination in consultation with the local planning authority, and where necessary, the Environment Agency. 2) Where the undertaker determines that remediation of the contaminated land is necessary, a written scheme and programme for the remedial measures to be taken to render the land fit for its intended purpose must be submitted to and approved in writing by the local planning authority, following consultation with the Environment Agency. 3) Remediation must be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme under sub paragraph (2). 4) Following the implementation of the remediation strategy approved under sub-paragraph (2), a verification report, based on the data collected as part of the remediation strategy and demonstrating the completion of the remediation measures must be produced and supplied to the relevant planning authority and the Environment Agency.		agreed in writing with the planning authority) may be carried out on the areas on which the contamination has been found until a remediation strategy detailing how such contamination must be dealt with has been submitted to and approved by the planning authority.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	General feedback	In regards to requirement 8 Landscape and ecology management plans, we wish to include the following wording: • (3) The landscape and ecological management plan must include details of: o A non-native invasive species management Plan, outlining the management and removal of any INNS that are detected during the construction phase. We request that the following requirement is input:• "European protected species o (1) No [stage of the] authorised development shall commence until [further] survey work has been carried out to establish whether a European protected species is present on any of the land affected, or likely to be affected, by the authorised development or in any of the trees to be lopped or felled or buildings to be demolished during [that stage of] the authorised development. o (2) Where a European protected species is shown to be present, no authorised development [of that stage] shall be begun until, after consultation with the relevant planning authority, Natural England and the Secretary of State for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, a scheme of protection and mitigation measures has been submitted to and approved by the Commission; and	No	The Outline CEMP (TA A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) includes a Construction Ecological Management Plan (CEcMP), with mitigation to prevent the spread of INNS set out at Section A5.3.11.12

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the authorised development shall be carried out in accordance with the approved scheme.(3) "European protected species" has the same meaning as in regulations 38 and 42 of the Conservation (Natural Habitats, &c.) Regulations 1994(2)."		
Environment Agency	General feedback	Under 44 (Procedure in relation to certain approvals etc.), we note that the procedure for approving requirements is stated as being detailed in schedule 16. This is not correct - It is found in schedule 14. Under 44 (Procedure in relation to certain approvals etc.) we request that (4) is amended to the following:• (4) Save for applications made pursuant to Schedule 16 (procedure for discharge of requirements) and where stated to the contrary if, within eight weeks (or such longer period as may be agreed between the undertaker and the relevant consenting authority in writing) after the application or request has been submitted to a consenting authority it has not notified the undertaker of its disapproval and the grounds of disapproval, it is deemed to have refused the application or request.	Yes	The draft requirements have been updated in the submission draft of the DCO. Standard discharge provisions have been incorporated which are consistent with other solar DCO recently made.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	General feedback	Under Interpretation, "commence" is defined as the following:• "commence" means beginning to carry out a material operation, as defined in section 155 (when development begins) of the 2008 Act, comprised in or carried out for the purposes of the authorised development other than the permitted preliminary works (except where stated to the contrary) and "commencement" and "commenced" are to be construed accordingly We note that permitted preliminary works include:• (d) remedial work in respect of any contamination or other adverse ground conditions Such works are pre-commencement activities that could be undertaken without the controls that only apply following commencement. This means that remediation of the site could take place without the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) (Requirement 12) being approved or in place. It also means that remedial works can take place before the Contamination Risk Assessment under Requirement 16 for Land Contamination has been produced and agreed. Significant environmental effects cannot be ruled out. Therefore, we advise that "(d) remedial work in respect of any contamination or other	No	Sub-paragraph (d) is a standard permitted preliminary work, included in orders such as The West Burton Solar Project Order 2025, The East Yorkshire Solar Farm Order 2025 and The Cottam Solar Project Order 2024. In none of those Orders do the CEMP requirement prohibit permitted preliminary works from being undertaken before the requirement is discharged.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		adverse ground conditions" is removed from the "permitted preliminary works" list, and that such works are undertaken with controls that apply at commencement (i.e., controls within Requirements 12 and 16 apply).		
Environment Agency	General feedback	We note that a reference to BESS permission meaning planning permission reference 23/00317/FULM was a mistake, as confirmed via email dated 05 February 2025.	No	Noted.
Environment Agency	General feedback	Site Waste Management Plans (SWMP) are no longer a legal requirement, however, in terms of meeting the objectives of the waste hierarchy and your duty of care, they are a useful tool and considered to be best practice. The circular economy is a concept designed to keep materials in use as long as possible, thus promoting resource efficient practice and deriving economic benefits. Adherence to the waste hierarchy and adoption of best practice in relation to site waste management planning will help you deliver against circular economy objectives.	No	This is noted, and this topic is addressed in ES TA A5.3, Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	General feedback	Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust agreed to be in a partnership formed by Elements Green that also includes the RSPB, Sherwood Forest Trust, Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust, and The Trent Rivers Trust, to ensure that nature benefits from this ambitious project. Productive discussion took place towards the end of 2024 on many of the biodiversity focussed elements of the project but due to time constraints that feedback has not made it into the draft PIER that we are currently being consulted on. To ensure our feedback is captured fully we reiterate our comments here and provide support for the feedback of others within the partnership.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	General feedback	General checks by the site manager to assess fencing, litter, and proper storage of materials	No	These matters will form part of ongoing Operations and Maintenance obligations.
NGET	General feedback	Due to the proximity of some of our existing or future assets, NGET wishes to express their interest in further consultation while the impact on our assets is still being assessed. Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		within close proximity to any of NGET's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights. NGET assets form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Please continue to consult NGET in regards to this development. NGET will require an adequate form of Protective Provisions included within the Order.		
NGET	General feedback	NGET requests that all existing and future assets are given due consideration given their criticality to distribution of energy across the UK. We remain committed to working with the promoter in a proactive manner, enabling both parties to deliver successful projects wherever reasonably possible. As such we encourage that ongoing discussion and consultation between both parties is maintained on interactions with existing or future assets, land interests, connections or consents and any other NGET interests which have the potential to be impacted prior to submission of the Proposed DCO.	No	This is noted and there have been extensive conversations with NGET prior to submission, refer to grid connection statement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
NGET	General feedback	The Great Grid Upgrade is the largest overhaul of the electricity grid in generations, we are in the middle of a transformation, with the energy we use increasingly coming from cleaner greener sources. Our infrastructure projects across England and Wales are helping to connect more renewable energy to homes and businesses. To find out more about our current projects please refer to our network and infrastructure webpage. https://www.nationalgrid.com/electricitytransmission/networkandinfrastructure/infrastructure-projects. Where it has been identified that your project interacts with or is in close proximity to one of NGET's infrastructure projects, we would welcome further discussion at the earliest opportunity	No	This project is not in proximity to one of the infrastructure projects and interaction with NGET has been extensive.
NGET	General feedback	National Grid's Overhead Line/s is protected by a Deed of Easement/Wayleave Agreement which provides full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our asset	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
NGET	General feedback	Statutory electrical safety clearances must be maintained at all times. Any proposed buildings must not be closer than 5.3m to the lowest conductor. National Grid recommends that no permanent structures are built directly beneath overhead lines. These distances are set out in EN 43 – 8 Technical Specification for "overhead line clearances Issue 5 (2019)", which publicly available..	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.
NGET	General feedback	If any changes in ground levels are proposed either beneath or in close proximity to our existing overhead lines, then this would serve to reduce the safety clearances for such overhead lines. Safe clearances for existing overhead lines must be maintained in all circumstances.	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.
NGET	General feedback	The relevant guidance in relation to working safely near to existing overhead lines is contained within the Health and Safety Executive's (www.hse.gov.uk) Guidance Note GS 6 "Avoidance of Danger from Overhead Electric Lines" and all relevant site staff should make sure that they are both aware of and understand this guidance	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
NGET	General feedback	Plant, machinery, equipment, buildings or scaffolding should not encroach within 5.3 metres of any of our high voltage conductors when those conductors are under their worse conditions of maximum "sag" and "swing" and overhead line profile (maximum "sag" and "swing") drawings should be obtained using the contact details above.	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.
NGET	General feedback	If a landscaping scheme is proposed as part of the proposal, we request that only slow and low growing species of trees and shrubs are planted beneath and adjacent to the existing overhead line to reduce the risk of growth to a height which compromises statutory safety clearances.	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.
NGET	General feedback	Drilling or excavation works should not be undertaken if they have the potential to disturb or adversely affect the foundations or "pillars of support" of any existing tower. These foundations always extend beyond the base area of the existing tower and foundation ("pillar of support") drawings can be obtained using the contact details above	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
NGET	General feedback	National Grid Electricity Transmission high voltage underground cables are protected by a Deed of Grant; Easement; Wayleave Agreement or the provisions of the New Roads and Street Works Act. These provisions provide National Grid full right of access to retain, maintain, repair and inspect our assets. Hence, we require that no permanent / temporary structures are to be built over our cables or within the easement strip. Any such proposals should be discussed and agreed with National Grid prior to any works taking place.	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.
NGET	General feedback	Ground levels above our cables must not be altered in any way. Any alterations to the depth of our cables will subsequently alter the rating of the circuit and can compromise the reliability, efficiency and safety of our electricity network and requires consultation with National Grid prior to any such changes in both level and construction being implemented.	No	These matters shall be secured via protective provisions within the DCO for the consultee and engagement has commenced.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	We have reviewed these chapters and have no specific comments to make on Chapters 1, 2, 3 and 5. In relation to Chapter 4 (Site Selection and Design) we note and understand the requirement to consider 'reasonable alternatives' as required by Regulation	No	Noted. ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** contains more detail on

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		14(2) (d) of the EIA Regulations. 1In this regard, we look forward to considering in more detail any alternative options i.e. more specific areas of land and/or a scale of development that may offer a reduced effect on the environment, in comparison to the proposed development as assessed in the final version of this chapter, when presented as part of the Environmental Statement (ES).		alternatives considered, and the environmental aspects affected by the decisions between these alternatives, than was presented in the PEIR
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Finally, in addition to the above, we note that various PEIR chapters make no reference to local planning policy at all. All relevant parts of the development plan should be taken into account as they form part of the relevant policy framework for which EIA should be undertaken. These policies are noted as being relevant material considerations in the consideration of this NSIP project and should be given proper consideration in the Environmental Statement and other key documents, including (but not necessarily limited to) the Planning Statement.	No	The EIA is undertaken in accordance with the EIA Regulations. Compliance with planning policy is a different matter, and this is dealt with in the Planning Statement that accompanies the application. Policy is included in the ES chapters only where it affects how the assessment is carried out, such as in influencing the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				identification and sensitivity of receptors.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Overall, the PEIR chapter has followed the EIA Scoping Opinion as adopted by the Planning Inspectorate (PINS). Annotated photos have not been provided as stated, the baseline views have been supported by wirelines.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Cumulative Effects assessment should consider "the cumulation of effects with other existing and, or approved projects, taking into account any existing environmental problems relating to areas of particular environmental importance likely to be affected or the use of natural resources" 7 Clarity is required as the PEIR sets out the that cumulative effects are considered against developments 'expected to be completed'8 and also with reference to the future baseline. As part of the ES, we would hope to agree the development which should be considered in a cumulative assessment, and these may not be restricted to those currently listed	No	The assessment is consistent with Planning Inspectorate (PINS) Advice on Cumulative Assessments. The advice highlights the need to consider the potential for cumulative effects arising due to the interactions between different components of the development, as well as with other existing development and/or approved development (the latter of which is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				addressed in ES Chapter 2 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**).
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	In support of the application is GNR_PEIR_Fig05.2_Masterplan, which is presented as a whole site red line followed by Sheets 1-9 presenting detailed information. The masterplan information is presented clearly, and the graphics are legible. It may be advantageous to have a universal key as a sperate figure rather than having to refer back to the main red line plan each time.	Yes	This has been noted and the masterplans now all contain a key for ease of understanding and reading.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	We would also need more clarification on other BESS schemes and the accumulation of those in other areas for the next stages of the project in respect of cumulative effects.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	NSDC have reviewed the NTS and whilst it does largely present a focussed document and the use of simple questions such as 'what the potential effects' are and 'how will the effects be managed' are useful in assisting understanding to the non-technical reader. Notwithstanding this at 63 pages (including figures) it is still a long document (and likely to increase in length when it comes to the final version of the ES) and	Yes	This feedback has been taken on board in the revised NTS submitted as part of the ES. It is noted, however, that whilst the terminology should be non-technical, the EIA Regulations

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		therefore the Applicant is encouraged to consider any sections of the NTS that can be rationalised. For example, the introductory sections 1-5 are perhaps arguably of less interest to the nontechnical reader and could perhaps be consolidated. Equally, Section 6 Planning Policy could perhaps be limited to explaining the role policy plays in decision making and its different parts, without summarising policy content. Finally, we would also recommend the Applicant consider whether the number of figures included could also be reduced and/or rationalised.		require that the document should be a summary, and omitting summaries of certain chapters may be seen as not meeting the requirements of the EIA Regulations.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	We have reviewed the Central Booklet and have no specific comments to make	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	At Paragraph 1.2 (Scope and Purpose) reference is made to the National Design Guide. Whilst is laudable, that the Applicant is seeking to consider matters of design, the Guide primarily covers built development with a focus on housing and therefore NSDC would question that if referred to in more detail, whether it will prove helpful given the nature of the development proposed.	Yes	The Design Approach Document (DaD) contained in ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** puts context to design

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				approach considerations for the Development.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	NSDC also note the comment at Paragraph 1.2 that the document 'does not provide a full appraisal against current planning policy, which is set out within the Planning Statement.' Whilst noting this point, as the document is developed, we would recommend providing more detail on relevant national and local planning policy, where that provides more detail on the framework within which issues of design were considered. This should include the National Policy Statements for Energy, the NPPF and the Development Plan for NSDC.	Yes	This is noted and the Design Approach Document (DaD) **[EN010162/APP/5.6]** has been updated to detail how policy relating to design consideration has been followed throughout the development of the design, in line with the initial design principles.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	At Paragraph 3, information is provided on site selection. As a minor point, it would have been more helpful if the document had been formatted to a landscape orientation for Figure 1 and therefore on a single page, rather than split across 2 pages, as it is presented. This point also applies to figures throughout the document.	Yes	Many Figures have now been amended to landscape to make for ease of reading. Some of the plans have to be at a certain scale e.g., 1:2500 - therefore the plan is split across multiple pages. This is to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				ensure all detail is easily captured and read. There are multiple plans across the application documents and ES showing the entire site in portrait and also landscape where possible and this splitting process has only taken place for certain plans where it has been absolutely necessary.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Further to this, NSDC would also ask the Applicant in responding to the consultation to consider the extent of the 'Order Limits' as currently drawn. Whilst noting that there may be a need for flexibility as is the norm for DCO projects, the extent of this area should be carefully reviewed from the perspective of rationalisation and the Applicant should only be seeking land on a permanent and a temporary basis that is strictly necessary for the delivery of the project. There are a number of areas within the Order Limits	Yes	The Order Limits have indeed been reduced and rationalised significantly at final design stage.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		that do not contain Solar Arrays or associated development (including mitigation). Whilst some linear areas may be needed for vehicular access purposes, there are a number of areas where no specific development is currently defined. Such areas should be clarified and/or removed from the scheme as the design is developed further following the statutory consultation period.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Part 1 (Preliminary) (2) (page 5)) Under 'Interpretations' makes reference to the "BESS Permission." We would clarify whether the application reference number is correct as it does not correspond with the Appeal Reference number given. It is assumed that the correct reference number is 22/01840/FULM.	No	This is noted and the definition has been corrected as follows: "BESS permission" means planning permission reference 22/01840/FULM granted on appeal by the Planning Inspectorate on 3 May 2024 (appeal reference: APP/B3030/W/23/3334043) authorising the construction of a battery energy storage system

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and associated infrastructure on part of the Order land.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Part 2(8) (page 10) Application and Modification of Statutory Provisions, seeks to nullify the requirements of various legislation in relation to Tree Preservation Orders, Neighbourhood Planning, and the Community Infrastructure Regulations. NSDC would seek further discussion on these proposals, particularly as the adopted CIL Policy within the NSDC district would not capture NSIP projects of this type and there are no made or draft Neighbourhood Plans within the Order limits area.	No	Noted. These applications are sought on the basis that they address matters whose merits and acceptability can, and will, already have been sufficiently considered and resolved if the Order is made. Such matters should therefore not be the subject of further regulatory consideration or control, which would cause unnecessary uncertainty and duplication, and may unjustifiably delay the implementation of the Authorised

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Development. Furthermore, whilst the comments regarding CIL policy and Neighbourhood plans are noted, it may be possible that this situation may change, and the Applicant would not wish this to create delay or uncertainty for the Development in the future.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Part 2(9) (Page 11) Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance seeks to limit the normal powers of the LPA. NSDC would comment at this stage, that the necessity for such provision, should first be informed by an understanding of the predicted noise impacts of the proposed development based on the final design and associated noise assessment.	No	Article 9 (Defence to proceedings in respect of statutory nuisance) provides that no person is able to bring statutory nuisance proceedings under the Environmental Protection Act 1990 in respect of noise, if the noise is created in the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				course of carrying out construction or maintenance or decommissioning of the authorised development and for which notice has been given under section 60 or consent obtained under section 61 of the Control of Pollution Act 1974 or which cannot be reasonably avoided as a consequence of the authorised development. This article, excluding paragraph (2) has precedent in recent DCOs, for example article 7 of the Cottam Solar Project Order 2024, the Gate Burton Energy Park Order 2024

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and the Mallard Pass Solar Farm DCO 2024. Article 9 is a model provision, in recognition that such noise will arise and that provision to define its consequences in an appropriate and balanced manner will be needed. This will be true of the Scheme and for this reason it is necessary to include the article in the Order. It should be noted that measures to mitigate noise impacts are set out in the Requirements in Schedule 2 to the Order, with assessment of noise effects having been undertaken within

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				the relevant chapter of the Environmental Statement.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Part 4(18) (Page 17) Protective works to buildings seeks broad powers to enter both land and buildings to undertake protective works as may be necessary. It would be helpful if the applicant were able to identify the areas where they consider this may be necessary, given that the powers sought are very broad and result in notable inconvenience for affected parties, even if the approach would be to undertake such works with agreement with affected parties in the first instance.	No	The Applicant is not aware of any likely need for such entry and works despite the provisions cited.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Part 6 (38 and 39) (Page 29) relates to felling and lopping of trees/removal of hedgerows and trees subject to a Tree Preservation Order (TPO). At this point, NSDC would clarify that such powers, should not be used as means to avoid the proper consideration of the impacts of the proposed development in respect of trees and hedgerows (refer to our earlier comments in this regard). Any works necessary, particularly in relation to high value natural assets such as TPO trees, should be subject to assessment and any works necessary, properly explained, and justified. In particular, the use of the term 'near' in relation to trees to be felled or lopped etc. is far too loosely defined and this should be given further consideration, alongside the outputs of the assessment work in relation to potential impacts on trees, hedgerows, and associated vegetation.	No	The Arboricultural Impact Assessment (TA A8.12 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.12]**) includes detailed consideration of trees and hedgerows.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Part 6(44) (Page 31) refers to the procedure in relation to certain approvals that may be necessary, separate to the process that relates to the discharge of requirements. It would be helpful for the applicant to advise of any circumstances (beyond the discharge of requirements if permission were forthcoming) where	No	The Other Consents and licences document is contained within the application pack **[EN010162/APP/7.3]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		they consider the consent or agreement of NSDC may be required. In this respect and more widely, it may be useful for the applicant to share a draft of a Consents and Agreements Position Statement at the preapplication stage.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Part 6(50) (Page 33) relates to inconsistent planning permissions and notes that from the date of which the authorised development commences, any planning permission granted which is inconsistent with the authorised development will cease to have effect. As this provision would potentially prevent the implementation of a planning permission, the Applicant should seek to define how they would measure 'inconsistent' as this could potentially capture both direct and indirect impacts of a broad nature.	No	Article 52 (Article 50 as it was at PEIR) (Inconsistent planning permission) is based on the drafting of article 56 from Lower Thames Crossing, which was granted consent in March 2025. Article 51 is included to address the legal uncertainty that can arise where multiple consents granted under different statutory regimes apply to the same land. In particular, this Article safeguards against enforcement

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				risks and potential barriers to implementation caused by inconsistencies between planning permissions granted under the TCPA and the development authorised by the Order. Paragraph (1) permits certain development authorised by a planning permission granted under the TCPA that is within the Order limits to be carried out pursuant to the terms of the planning permission without breaching the Order. This provision ensures that the undertaker does not

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				breach section 161 of the 2008 Act in carrying out certain development pursuant to a grant of planning permission. These provisions have been precedented in numerous highway DCOs including article 7 of M20 Junction 10a, article 7 of A30 Chiverton to Carland Cross and article 6 of Amesbury to Berwick Down and most recently in article 56 of Lower Thames Crossing. Paragraphs (2) and (3) ensure that development in respect of a planning permission granted under the TCPA does

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				not prevent the development in respect of the Order from proceeding, and vice versa. This ensures that both consents can lawfully exist within the Order limits, so far as possible. Paragraph (2) addresses the Supreme Court's ruling in Hilliside Parks Ltd v Snowdonia National Park Authority[1]. That judgment relates to planning permissions granted under the TCPA. It held that, unless there is an express provision otherwise, where an existing planning

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				permission has been implemented, a second permission which overlaps physically with that existing permission cannot be lawfully implemented if a physical incompatibility has been created by the implementation of the existing permission, which would prevent the later permission from being constructed. This scenario (commonly referred to as "overlapping consents") creates a risk that multiple permissions relating to the same land cannot be lawfully implemented.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Paragraph (2) seeks to mitigate this risk by ensuring that enforcement action is not taken in respect of planning permissions granted under the TCPA, or conditions attached to them, where they are inconsistent with the works and exercise of powers under the Order. This provision ensures that such permissions or conditions do not give rise to enforcement action, notwithstanding the fact that a condition may no longer be capable of being complied with as a result of the authorised development. The

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				provision is based on the drafting in the article 56 of the Lower Thames Crossing. It is considered this is necessary to confirm that developments are not prevented but can exist as "overlapping consents" without falling foul of Hillside. Paragraph (3) deals with the converse situation and confirms that development under a planning permission is not to prevent activity authorised under the Order. Maintaining these provisions in the Order

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				are vital to address matters which relate to the long-term interaction between future planning permissions and the Order. In the absence of this provision, there is potential for an amendment to the Order to be required. It would be wholly disproportionate and inappropriate to have to seek an amendment to the Order in those circumstances.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Schedule 2 (Pages 38 – 43) Part 1 (Interpretation). In respect of the definition of authorities, we would suggest that as the draft DCO document is developed and revised, this extends to include and define which authority (NSDC or NCC) is the responsible planning authority, for the discharge of which specific requirement. In respect of the requirements as	No	The DCO has been prepared to identify which authority the Applicant considers is best placed to discharge each matter. The additional requirements

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		currently drafted, we would ask the Applicant to consider the need for further requirements to include a Biodiversity Net Gain Strategy and a Community Liaison Group.		have also been added. A Biodiversity Net Gain strategy is underway and a pre-commencement requirement for a Community Liaison Scheme has been proposed.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Part 3(Phasing) We note from recent discussions that for the purposes of the PEIR an assumption has been made in relation to there being a minimum of 2 phases, but this could be subject to change. For a development of this scale and spread across a geographical area, this does appear to be a limited number of phases. If delivered over two phases, it is quite possible that construction stage impacts could be intensified and as a consequence be more significant than a construction programme that is split across a greater number of phases. This should be subject to further consideration as part of the development of the PEIR into the Environmental Statement.	No	The Applicant confirms that there will be a minimum of 2 construction phases.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Schedule 14(2) – Applications made under provisions of this Order identifies a period of 56 days for the consideration of discharge of requirements, which NSDC consider to be insufficient. The level of information within each requirement is likely to be significant and NSDC consider the time period should be a minimum of 13 weeks, akin to the time period for the consideration of major planning applications. Such a change should also include the retention of Section 2(1) (c)) which allows for the agreement of a longer period between the parties, as is deemed necessary. Aligned to this, NSDC would also suggest that part of this procedure should include agreement for the phasing of submission of discharge requirements requests, to an agreed programme in advance of the submission of the first discharge of requirement request. This will greatly assist in the resourcing of such requests.	No	This Schedule provides a bespoke procedure for dealing with an application made to the relevant authority (as defined in the Schedule) for any consent, agreement or approval required or contemplated by the provisions of the Order. It sets out time periods within which decisions must be made and provides for deemed approval of the applications in certain circumstances. These periods are consistent with previously made DCOs and are considered reasonable for the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				discharge of requirements, noting the urgent need for this development. Paragraph 4 makes provision for appeals to be made in the event of a refusal of an application or if the relevant authority requires further information to be provided in relation to that application. Paragraph 5 provides for the payment by the undertaker of fees to the relevant authority for the processing of an application for consent, agreement or approval in respect of a requirement

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				only. The fee schedule included in paragraph 5 represents the Applicant's reasonable offer to fund the relevant authority for discharging the relevant requirements in Schedule 2 of the Order and to address resource requirements. The fees are set out in categories to reflect the level of resource that will be required for dealing with an application under the different requirements in Schedule 2. This is broadly based on the Town and Country Planning (Fees for Applications, Deemed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Applications, Requests and Site Visits) (England) Regulations 2012, (as amended by the 2017 Regulations) (the "Fee Regulations") with amendments made to reflect the nature and scale of the Authorised Development. Subparagraph 5(2) provides that where an application is not decided within the specified period the amount paid under sub-paragraph 5(1) shall be refunded to the undertaker, which is based on the principle established in Regulation 16(2) of the Fee Regulations.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Schedules similar to Schedule 14 have been used in various made orders and can be seen in similar form therein (see, for example, The Sunnica Energy Farm Order 2024, The Longfield Solar Farm Order 2023, The Hornsea Four Offshore Wind Farm Order 2023, The Mallard Pass Solar Farm Order 2024, The Gate Burton Energy Park Order 2024 and The Cottam Solar Farm Order 2024). The bespoke process is required in order to ensure that applications under the Order are

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				dealt with efficiently so that the authorised development is not held up, and to provide greater certainty with regard to the time periods involved in discharging requirements. Deemed consent of applications is required for the same reason and ensures that the projects required to meet a national need will not be held up by the discharge of requirements. The Schedule relates to Article 46 (Procedure in relation to certain approvals etc.). With regard to phasing

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				of submission, it will be in the interests of the Applicant to continue to liaise and discuss programmes with the host authority in order to ensure the alignment of appropriate resource. This has been the approach the pre-application phase of the DCO. However, we do not consider that it would be appropriate for the Applicant to be tied to a pre-agreed programme, which may delay the project.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Finally, in relation to Schedule 14, Section 5 (Fees), NSDC note that a fee is to be provided to NSDC for the discharge of requirements, with the level of fee to be agreed. NSDC confirm that in order to respond to this resourcing requirement and manage the day-to-day	No	NSDC fees have been arranged via PPA so far and that agreed approach will continue in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		requirements of the planning service, an appropriate fee should be agreed, to reflect the time and inputs necessary.		terms of discharging day-to-day requirements
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	NSDC welcome the fact that the Applicant has shared the Commitments Register at an early stage of the process, as part of the statutory consultation. In section 2 of the document, it is noted that 'The PEIR assesses the potential effects of the Development, with the Development being defined by the Development Description (Chapter 5) and embedded measures, which comprise the measures set out in the following Technical Appendices (TAs).' NSDC would add that the development will be defined within the DCO itself within Schedule 1 as Work No's alongside the Works Plans themselves. Further to this, it is noted that there are a variety of commitments within the Commitments Register (Section 4 - table) (for example 7.1, 8.1 etc.) that do not identify a Commitment Securing Mechanism. Whilst it is noted that these relate to embedded mitigation, in most cases they are also captured by a document e.g. LEMP, CEMP that are themselves drafted as a requirement and in this	Yes	The Commitments Register has been updated taking on these suggestions.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		regard, for clarity it should be noted that there is a means to deliver such commitments.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	NSDC have identified a number of areas within the PEIR and associated material (available as part of the statutory consultation), whereby further work is necessary, or is to be undertaken. In order to ensure that a robust DCO application is prepared, NSDC would welcome the opportunity for further informal consultation and engagement as further work is undertaken and prior to the submission of the application to the Planning Inspectorate. In this regard, we would welcome a programme of activities on further areas of engagement, so that we can plan our resources accordingly and to support our ongoing active engagement, at the pre-application stage.	No	The requested consultation and engagement work has been carried out between NSDC and the Applicant since the PEIR stage
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	In particular, we would welcome the further opportunity to discuss cumulative impacts and the 'committed 'developments that should be captured in any cumulative assessment as part of continuing work in undertaking the EIA and producing the ES. Aligned to this, we would welcome the opportunity to consider in more detail alternative areas of land that have been considered, again as part of the requirement under the	Yes	The cumulative list was consulted upon and agreed with NSDC and the alternative areas of land can be viewed in Chapter 4 Alternatives **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		EIA regulations to consider alternatives. We would also welcome the opportunity to consider the final result of the ALC assessment, once all survey work has been complete.		And the Design Approach Document (DaD) **[EN010162/APP/5.6]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	As you will appreciate, this NSIP project is of a significant size and scale and accordingly the explanation and justification for its location and the final scheme proposals presented for examination should follow a through consideration of a scheme that has the least possible environmental impacts and a robust programme of mitigation, secured through the DCO.	No	Explanations around design process are captured in the Design Approach Document (DaD) **[EN010162/APP/5.6]** and impacts and mitigation are discussed throughout the Chapters of the ES.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	General feedback	Finally, we have also received some late representations direct from two of our Parish Councils, namely Carlton on Trent Parish Council and Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council. We have not had the opportunity to review these submissions, but in order to ensure they are received by the Applicant, we Append these two representations as Appendix One. NSDC would ask that the representations are carefully	No	The Applicant confirms receipt of feedback appended to Newark and Sherwood District Council's response. Feedback from Carlton on Trent and Laxton and Moorhouse has been captured in this table:

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		considered and taken into account by the Applicant, based on the issues identified.		Section 42 Applicant Response Table, **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**.
Natural England	General feedback	It is noted in para 153 and 157 that the need for and scope of an HRA will be determined in accordance with government guidance and in consultation with Natural England. The Secretary of State (SoS) is the Competent Authority for the purposes of the Habitat Regulations and is responsible for undertaking the HRA for the project. Nonetheless, NE advise that the applicant should provide all relevant scientific evidence to enable the competent authority to complete their HRA, including a clear rationale for the screening out of all potential impacts, both alone and in-combination with other plans/projects. This may be best delivered within a separate 'report to inform' the HRA, or a clearly marked section of the ES which includes all relevant information, in one place	No	A Report to Inform Habitats Regulations Assessment in included as Technical Appendix A8.14 of the ES.
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	General Feedback	With regard to the request for consultation response regarding the above project I would advise that the proposed development crosses areas under the control of Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	General Feedback	There are numerous watercourses that are likely to be impacted by the development, principally by the proposed route of the Cable corridors but also potentially above ground installations and accommodation works.		This is noted in ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	General Feedback	I feel that it is important to raise some specific issues that will need to be considered further and in detail as a part of the DCO process.	No	Noted.
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	General Feedback	All Board watercourses are subject to Byelaws, which are intended to protect the watercourses and the Board's ability to maintain them.	No	Noted.
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	General Feedback	Inform the Board in writing of the execution and of the circumstances in which it was executed and comply with any reasonable directions the Board may give with regard thereto.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	General Feedback	It should be noted that the Board's consent is required irrespective of any permission gained under the Town and Country Planning Act 1990. The Board's consent will only be granted where proposals are not detrimental to the flow or stability of the watercourse/ culvert or the Board's machinery access to the watercourse/ culvert which is required for annual maintenance, periodic improvement and emergency works. The Board would not look to be disapplying these powers unless they have been suitably agreed and covered within the protected provisions embedded within the DCO.		The Applicant has begun the process of engagement for protective provisions for the Internal Drainage Boards.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council (Appended to NSDC Response)	General Feedback	The area to the West of the village has been identified as prime solar farm real-estate and hence the proposed 7000 acre, GNR Solar Farm will directly impact the village with part of the development falling within the parish boundary.	No	Noted.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council (Appended to	General Feedback	As part of the Joint Parish Action Group (JPAG) survey of all affected parishes, residents of Carlton on Trent were asked their opinion of the development. 48 responses came from Carlton on Trent residents (a significant response rate	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
NSDC Response)		of 26%) indicating that 77% were firmly against the development with only 4 responses being in favour.		
North Muskham Parish Council	Glint and glare	The PC are concerned that it may be difficult to assess the scope of glint and glare impact until more exact panel height, type (fixed or tracking) and locations are known. Until then, as well as transport receptors, a precautionary approach that scopes in any ground receptor within the identified zones of visual influence should be taken.	No	Effects of glint and glare on the visual amenity of recreational receptors are taken account of within ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. It is agreed that it is not possible to assess all impacts with complete certainly at this stage. A full assessment of the indicative scheme has been undertaken. Glint and Glare will continue to inform the detailed design process post consent (within the bounds of the consented

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				envelope) to ensure the final scheme has no significant effects.
North Muskham Parish Council	Glint and glare	Glare and flashing lights are widely known to be common causes, and solar panels create both glare and flashing lights. Glare occurs just looking at one on a sunny day. Passing row after row of panels by train or car, the silver frames are flashing lights even on a dull day, or in headlights. Any epileptic living near a solar panel at ground level or wanting to walk in a field near a solar panel at ground level is at risk of having a seizure caused by glare.	No	The glint and glare assessment has used the standard drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance with Network Rail requirements. The 3D glint and glare modelling software takes terrain/elevation changes into account. That final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties including Network Rail and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	The Applicant has submitted a provisional Glint and Glare Assessment (GGA). The range of this assessment was addressed during the scoping process. The Planning Inspectorate took the view that the Applicant was attempting to wrongly limit the GGA to road users, residents, rail users and aviation.	No	All consultation responses relating to glint and glare aspects of the Scoping Report [TA A3.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.3.1]** , including those from the Planning Inspectorate, were used to inform the scope of the subsequent assessment
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	The Applicant's GGA has taken on board horse riders, agricultural workers, waterway users and receptors at different heights above ground level. However, it has so far decided to ignore PINS on the other receptors.	Yes	The glint and glare assessment includes consideration of all relevant receptor types. Where required, consideration of discipline-specific receptor types is provided within the respective ES chapter (e.g. Chapter 8, Ecology

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**).
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	What is also mentioned in the PINs publication is glint and glare should also inform the assessment of effects on landscape and visual impact.	Yes	Glint and Glare effects have been taken into consideration as part of the ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	The Applicant predicts 18 residences which will be impacted by glint and glare but only one where the impact is significant.	Yes	Noted. This finding has informed the design of the Development. The PV array has been set further back from the property in question in order to mitigate the predicted effects.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	The residential receptor height was set at 2m AGL and therefore did not address impacts to receptors when upstairs.	No	There is no specific guidance in UK planning policy which stipulates particular receptor heights. However, it is common practice to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				assess effects at or around head height in external / ground floor areas. The ground floor is typically considered the main living space and therefore has a greater sensitivity with respect to residential amenity.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	The Council expresses concern there will be no glint and glare assessment for those moving about the areas as the experience will be a glint, not a glare.	No	Glint and glare are in essence the same effect - glint is simply of a shorter duration. The impact upon moving receptors is purely assessed in terms of glare intensity, and therefore the duration of the effect has no effect on the significance.
Norwell and Norwell	Glint and glare	This Council included in its scoping opinion that there should be closer scrutiny of the potential impacts on	Yes	The 3D glint and glare modelling software takes

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Woodhouse Parish Council		the East Coast Main Line (ECML) and the A1 northbound carriageway. The point was made that in a number of places, the track and road were raised above ground level. It is not clear from the GGA if the Applicant's software took these factors into account.		terrain/elevation changes into account. However, the final mitigation required to mitigate glint and glare effects is dependent upon many factors, including the location of the PV panels, their height, orientation, type, and tilt, as well as screening in terms of buildings, vegetation, hedgerows etc. As such, there are a virtually infinite number of potential options at this stage. It is therefore a standard approach to assess an indicative layout based on the largest potential array area, with typical

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				parameters for tilt, orientation etc, and the ES will consider potential mitigation options for that design. However, in order to ensure that the final mitigation properly responds to the actual design to be constructed, the detailed mitigation will be designed to match the final PV design. That final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties including the Council, Network Rail etc, and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	Firstly, in addressing the A1 northbound carriageway, the Applicant adopts a receptor height of 2.5m. This is intended to include the vision height above ground level for HGV drivers on this carriage way.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	If the vision height above ground level was changed to 2.8m, one could guess that the impact of that would not be great in any revised assessment.	No	By their nature, roads carry a range of traffic of varying types, makes and models. A height therefore needs to be selected which is representative of the range of possible user heights. In their PEIR response, it is of note that Highways England stated than the glint and glare assessment..."covers the expected receptors plus additional receptors and/or additional context considerations identified

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				as part of scoping opinion consultations."
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	The A1 in the North Muskham area. The vehicle is over 1m higher than the fields at the side of the road. Depending on which cab that is, the driver's eye height could well be 3.8m above the surrounding fields not 2.5m.	No	The 3D glint and glare modelling software takes terrain/elevation changes into account. Receptor heights are relative to the position of the receptor itself, rather than the surrounding land.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	Moving to the ECML, the Applicant has adopted the receptor vision height for train drivers as 2.7m.The Railway Group Standards state that mainline signalling is set at a height assuming driver vision height of 2.75m above track level.	No	The glint and glare assessment has used the standard drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance with Network Rail requirements.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	It is clear that the driver's eye level is far higher than 2.75m AGL. This divergence is aggravated by the fact that sections of the ECML track in the Cromwell and Muskham area are raised above the level of the fields, in which panels are intended on either side of the track.	No	The glint and glare assessment has used the standard drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				with Network Rail requirements. The 3D glint and glare modelling software takes terrain/elevation changes into account. That final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties including Network Rail, and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	Given which freight locomotives will be operating at the start of the GNR operational phase, the driver's vision travelling north on the ECML could be over 5m higher than the ground level in the panel fields immediately adjacent to the track and signals.	No	The glint and glare assessment has used the standard drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance with Network Rail requirements.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Glint and glare	The Council suggest that there is an argument for a reassessment of glint and glare for the ECML, the Applicant having obtained exact specifications from train operators.	No	The glint and glare assessment has used the standard drivers eye level height of 2.75m, which is in accordance with Network Rail requirements. The final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties including Network Rail, and will be submitted for their approval, prior to construction.
Forestry Commission	Glint and Glare	Also a lighting strategy to ensure that any lighting does not illuminate the ancient woodlands.	No	The details of the sensitive lighting design are included in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** and ES Chapter 8 Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Highways	Glint and Glare	The study provided appears fairly robust and covers the expected receptors plus additional receptors and/or additional context considerations identified as part of scoping opinion consultations undertaken	No	Noted.
National Highways	Glint and Glare	Aerodromes excepting Caunton airfield are not predicted to have exposure to glint and glare effects for approach paths and ATCTs. Effects to Caunton airfield are assessed as not increasing current glint and glare conditions from existing conditions, and reports the findings have been accepted by both the gliding club that operates from the airfield and Nottinghamshire Council.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Glint and Glare	Road receptors are anticipated to have a mixture of glint and glare effects, where certain stretches of the A1 and A616 could experience glare exceeding the green glare benchmarks. A617 and B6325 are not predicted to experience glint or glare effects.	No	In order to ensure that the final mitigation design properly responds to the actual design to be constructed, we are proposing a DCO requirement that the mitigation will be designed to match the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				final PV design. That mitigation will be designed in consultation with relevant parties, and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.
National Highways	Glint and Glare	Rail is not expected to experience glint or glare exceeding the green glare benchmarks.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Glint and Glare	Residential receptors excepting one property 150m east of the GG5 study area are considered to have no or low impact.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Glint and Glare	Waterways and other receptors, including PRoW/bridleway, boaters, nonresidential buildings, ecological receptors, are predicted to have no to low impact.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Highways	Glint and Glare	Based on the mixed results which include receptors that exceed the recommended benchmarks, mitigation is recommended. The report concludes that a detailed mitigation strategy is required and will be developed to manage these issues.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Glint and Glare	The study area set out for the glint and glare assessment incorporates a maximum zone of 500m for roads and rail, 200m for residential and a 5 – 10km zone for aviation receptors. a. The LVIA utilises a main study area of 5km and does not identify the potential for significant effects on views beyond approximately 0.7 km. b. The LVIA advises that the scale of development and location of some elevated viewpoints may retain visibility of solar arrays. Mitigation planting set out in the LVIA is identified as suitably reducing the extent of visibility close to the development area but identifies effects to remain at the same magnitude throughout the operational stage.	No	The glint and glare study areas are not based upon the distance beyond which the Development would no longer be visible. They instead relate to the distance beyond which there is no reasonable prospect of a significant glint and glare impact. The LVIA assessment study areas are based upon different criteria, and would therefore be expected to differ.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Highways	Glint and Glare	The study area provided in the glint and glare assessment indicates that the majority of effects will not be significant. b. Some of the receptor locations identified in the LVIA within their study area have the potential to retain views of the site for a number of years which may occur outside of the study area identified within the Glint and Glare assessment. c. Receptor locations should be cross-checked to see those located within the LVIA study area could be affected.	No	The glint and glare study areas are not based upon the distance beyond which the Development would no longer be visible. They instead relate to the distance beyond which there is no reasonable prospect of a significant glint and glare impact. The LVIA assessment study areas are based upon different criteria, and would therefore be expected to differ.
National Highways	Glint and Glare	It is not clearly set out where key locations that require mitigation are, although it is stated that mitigation is required. a. No mitigation measures are proposed as part of the TA A16.1 Glint and Glare assessment. b. A high-level mitigation strategy is provided as part of the LVIA assessment (ES Chapter 7).	No	The final mitigation required to mitigate glint and glare effects is dependent upon many factors, including the location of the PV panels, their height,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				orientation, type, and tilt, as well as screening in terms of buildings, vegetation, hedgerows etc. It is therefore a standard approach to assess an indicative layout based on the largest potential array area, with typical parameters for tilt, orientation etc, and the ES will consider potential mitigation options for that design. In order to ensure that the final mitigation properly responds to the actual design to be constructed, the detailed mitigation will be designed to match the final PV design. That

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties, and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.
National Highways	Glint and glare	ES Chapter 7 provides some information about landscape mitigation which can be summarised as providing infill planting for locations with sparse vegetation and new plantings (trees, hedgerows) where there is no existing landscape screening. a. Landscape mitigation will need to provide a consistent height and density for the majority of the year based on the assessment results which identify when glare is most likely to occur. b. A species mix (native, evergreen, tree, hedge, other) does not appear to be recommended and this should be considered as part of the mitigation proposals. Proposed landscape mitigation proposals provide recommended height targets which include: a. Management of existing hedgerow to increase height targeting 2 – 2.5m height.	No	Specification for the establishment and maintenance of screening hedges will be included in the LEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		b. New plantings to achieve a height of 2 – 2.5m. c. New trees and woodland to achieve heights of around 7 – 7.5m. A typical minimum growth height of 2 – 2.5 m is assumed to be sufficient to screen solar arrays from near ground-based receptors. a. Visibility may be influenced by changes in ground level. b. It is not clear if a final target growth height of 2 – 2.5m will provide sufficient screening of solar arrays from all receptors/viewpoints with direct views of them. Full heights of recommended landscape mitigation are expected to be achieved within 1 – 3 years for existing hedgerow, 7 – 10 years for new hedgerow and in 15 years for trees and woodland. a. It is not clear if there will be sufficient screening in place at the start of operation and additional temporary mitigation measures may be required until the milestone years are reached for landscape and vegetation. b. Additional mitigation measures needed to provide screening in intervening growth years should be developed. Please confirm that there is a regular maintenance check on vegetation that serves as		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		screening to ensure that sufficient height/density is maintained over the lifetime of the installation.		
Canal & River Trust	Glint and Glare	The Trust previously commented that solar panels have the potential to result in glint and glare impacts which could impact boaters and navigational safety on the River Trent. We therefore sought inclusion of boaters as potential receptors to glint and glare effects. We note that Glint and Glare consideration can now be found in Chapter 16 (Miscellaneous) and Technical Appendix A16.1. The former includes comment at paragraph 55 on modelling from the River Trent which concludes that no impacts on boaters is anticipated due to screening by woodland, hedgerows, and vegetation along the riverbank. This draft conclusion is mirrored in paragraph 99 of Technical Appendix A16.1. The inclusion of this issue within the PEIR is welcome although the Trust would observe that it may better form a component of the Landscape and Visual Effects chapter of the PEIR given the nature of the issue. Wherever the content finally rests, the evidence used to draw this conclusion should be fully set out within the ES, together with related solar panel design	Yes	The effects of glint and glare on boaters on the River Trent were initially presented within the PEIR, and are reassessed based upon the design of the Development in the ES.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		and layout solutions and screening mitigation measures.		
Canal & River Trust	Lighting	It is noted that Section 8.6.4 (Lighting) identifies the intended 'dark sky' policy. The Trust encourages the intended sensitive lighting design in the interests of reducing disturbance to nocturnal and crepuscular species common to our, and wider, local assets. The Construction Ecological Management Plan should address these matters for the construction phase of the scheme and wider lighting scheme design for subsequent operational phases and these should be included in the requirements of the draft DCO.	No	The details of the sensitive lighting design are included in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** and ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**
Eakring Parish Council	Glint and Glare	Once installed the panels will cause considerable sun glare.	No	Glint and Glare effects have been taken into consideration as set out in Technical Appendix A16.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Eakring Parish Council	Glint and Glare	Glint and glare will be visible from many of the PROW which will detract from the enjoyment of the routes.	No	Glint and Glare effects on PRoWs has been considered and is presented in Technical Appendix A16.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.1]**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Glint and Glare	NSDC note that a preliminary Glint and Glare assessment has been undertaken and is presented from section 16.3 onwards. It is noted that the assessment has identified possible significant glint and glare effects on parts of the A1 and A616 and that of one property (which is assumed to be a residential property, although this is not specified).	Yes	The PV array design for the ES has been set further back from the property (residential dwelling) in question in order to mitigate the predicted effects. With regard to effects on the A1 and A616, in order to ensure that the final mitigation properly responds to the actual design to be constructed, the detailed mitigation will be designed to match the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				final PV design. That final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties, and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Glint and Glare	Whilst it is understood that mitigations measures are being considered, NSDC would recommend direct engagement with both NCC as LHA and the individual property is discussed, so as to produce a solution that reduces these potentially significant effects to a reduced and acceptable level.	Yes	The PV array design for the ES has been set further back from the property (residential dwelling) in question in order to mitigate the predicted effects.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Put simply, Sutton on Trent cannot cope with any increase in additional water entering the village. Any development must ensure that flooding will not be exasperated and ideally modelling undertaken that goes over and above to ensure mitigation required provides security to those low lying villages that further flooding will be prevented.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	A further concern relates to possible contaminants resulting from the proposed construction traffic (oil and diesel), ongoing cleaning and maintenance of the sites involving the use of pesticides, herbicides, fertiliser and weed control once operational, as these could all add to the issues already experienced in the poor water quality in the area due to surface water runoff from the Site, naturally discharging into these ordinary water courses on the site boundaries.	No	Controls for oil and fuel spills during construction are set out in the Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP), provided as ES Technical Appendix A5.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** . These measures are an improvement on the baseline situation, as farm machinery does not

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				typically have such controls. No pesticides, herbicides or fertiliser will be used once the site is operational. The only weed control will be grazing by sheep and/or cutting by machine (strimmer/mower). This is set out in the Outline Landscape and Ecological Management Plan (oLEMP) (Technical Appendix A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**) . These are an improvement on the baseline situation, where such chemicals are routinely used in farm management.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Any fields that are within Flood Zone 3 should be precluded from development.	Yes	The Applicant has completed a flood risk assessment, which must be approved by the Environment Agency. The Applicant has identified solar parks do not increase flood risk nor will they build solar panels or substations within Flood Zones 2 and 3.
North Muskham Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Pluvial and fluvial extremes and return periods are being re-defined and will continue to do so as locked in climate change impacts increase. Climate change impacts on SUDS must be considered, especially in higher areas where overtopping will result in flooding at lower levels and down stream of watercourses.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , SuDS measures will be designed to accommodate the 1 % AEP plus 40 % allowance for climate change.
North Muskham	Hydrology, flood risk	Changes to the natural off flow from the land occupied by the Solar arrays is likely and is likely also to form new channels and ill-defined water courses. The risk of	No	The oCEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** outlines good

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council	and drainage	run off of any operational pollutants onto neighbouring arable land should be considered and scoped in.		construction practice measures to protect the water environment. As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
North Muskham Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Guarantees should be given to homeowners that areas that have not flooded previously will not become more vulnerable. Some form of redress and/or compensation should be included in the management plans.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
North Muskham Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The impact on acquifers in the development area should be determined, quantified and scoped in.	No	The potential effects on aquifers and groundwater is considered in the Water Resources chapter of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				the PEIR and will be assessed within the ES.
North Muskham Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	North Muskham and surrounding villages are very close to the River Trent, flooding is a constant problem, all the fields on the current plan drain into ditches / dykes and rivers which would become contaminated with toxic materials, endangering both humans and wildlife. Any toxic leaks would be devastating, killing organisms in rivers, destroying animals and plants and causing major reproductive complications in animals and plants in a contaminated area.	No	As detailed in Chapter 9: Water Resources, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**, a full assessment of contaminated land is provided in Chapter 10, Ground Conditions and Land Contamination **[EN010162/APP/6.2.10]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Improper handling and disposal of hazardous waste can cause severe health effects, including cancer, genetic mutations and birth defects. Entire communities can be hurt if hazardous waste seeps into water supplies and other public resources.	No	ES chapter 16 Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** includes an assessment of effects on air quality and from dust, and finds no significant effects, with further mitigation being provided in ES Technical Appendix A5.3, Outline Construction

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** Lighting restrictions are set out in ES chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** and in ES Technical Appendix A5.3, Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Fields 82, 93, 109, 142 and 37 should be removed due to increased flooding potential runoff into Moorhouse Beck which may affect lower laying solar arrays.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment and Outline Drainage Strategy (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Field 577 and 153 should be removed because its unreasonably close to residential dwellings.	Yes	The PV array design for the ES has been set further back from the property (residential dwelling) in question in order to mitigate the predicted effects. With regard to effects on the A1 and A616, in order to ensure that the final mitigation properly

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				responds to the actual design to be constructed, the detailed mitigation will be designed to match the final PV design. That final mitigation scheme will be designed in consultation with relevant parties, and will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Field 577 and 153 should be removed because of risk of increased flooding to a property and its land already affected by water run off and flooding	Yes	The PV array design for the ES has been set further back from the property (residential dwelling) in question in order to mitigate the predicted effects.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Moorhouse is uniquely situated within the proposed solar array in that it lies on the main drainage into the Trent for the array area. Lying in a shallow valley, Moorhouse already suffers, and is currently suffering from flooding to its properties, roads, hedgerows and where Moorhouse Beck and a number of tributaries meet.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.2]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Laxton is surrounded by higher farmland and consequently receives its surface water run off. Downstream from Laxton, Moorhouse receives all of the Laxton water and additional surface water run-off from South Field, Kneesall Woods, Laxton Woods and	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.2]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		North woods. 2023 saw Moorhouse Beck overwhelmed through Moorhouse causing flooding or near flooding to a number of properties. It was notable that the flooding was not prolonged and was a function of the Beck and its tributaries being unable to handle the volume of water draining from the fields in this area. Any actions that exacerbate runoff will undoubtedly widen the flood damage area and should be prevented.		runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Fields 13, 5, 577, 153, 82, 93, 109, 142, 154 and 37, in the circulated plan, around Moorhouse will directly affect the run-off into the beck. This flood bottleneck would be ameliorated by the removal of the panels from the contributing fields.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.2]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	In addition, any road traffic damage to the bridges in Moorhouse or the blocking of the beck or its tributaries downstream by construction debris will also have a significant negative effect.	No	The oCEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** identifies measures to reduce the potential for transfer of sediment during the construction phase and this will limit the potential for impediments to flow within watercourses.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Applicant to their credit has included an assessment on pollution for the operational phase. No criticism can be levied at the scope of this assessment as it was not required.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Council note the contents of the WFD assessment and have previously expressed concern regarding how close proposed ground works will be to the Beck.	No	Horizontal directional drilling (HDD) is proposed as the best practicable environmental option for crossing the larger watercourses, including the Beck.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The greatest ecological disruption surrounding the Beck will be during the construction phase. Some of this appears inevitable given the plans to horizontally drill underneath this watercourse. It would not be practicable to achieve this without temporary close proximity to this water course.	No	Horizontal directional drilling (HDD) is proposed as the best practicable environmental option for crossing the larger watercourses and woodland.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	There appears to be a dilution of the scoping report position which was submitted to PINs and which stipulated a 10m buffer between a watercourse and any ground works.	No	As outlined in the ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]** a 10 m watercourse edge buffer has been adhered to for all construction

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				works (i.e. solar PV and associated infrastructure, construction compounds, BESS, and substations) with the exception of watercourse crossings for cables and access tracks.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Applicant here appears to have shifted from their earlier position in that it now intends the pile driving of deer fence posts within 10m of the Beck . How close is not admitted though if the mapping is at all accurate, certainly seemingly very close, especially towards the northern border of field 206.	No	As outlined in the ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]** a 10 m watercourse edge buffer has been adhered to for all construction works (i.e. solar PV and associated infrastructure, construction compounds, BESS, and substations) with the exception of watercourse crossings

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				for cables and access tracks.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Council expresses concern for the proximity of the cable trenching near the south east bank of the Beck.	No	Methods for cable trenching are outlined in the oCEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** which will reduce the potential for effects on watercourses.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Council expressed concern the Beck may be in danger of a deterioration in WFD status which is forbidden by The Water Environment (Water Framework Directive) (England and Wales) Regulations 2017.	No	The WFD Assessment identifies that the Development will not lead to a deterioration in the WFD status of either surface waterbodies or groundwater.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	It is the Council's view that, save for horizontal drilling under the Beck, the mitigation measures required by Brindle and Green should also be adopted for this proposal.	No	Methods for HDD will be confirmed within the final CEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** prior to the construction phase of the Development.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The second table deals with the PV Module construction. It is planned that the construction of the mounting frames will be completed on site, cutting and rolling from metal coil. However there is no plant included in this table which could achieve this manufacturing process.	No	Methods will confirmed within the final CEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** prior to the construction phase of the Development.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	It is welcomes that the Applicant has chosen to use a panel design with rainwater gaps.	Yes	It is confirmed that rainwater gaps will be included within the PV array tables
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	It is conceded that PV panels do not per se cause more flooding.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Applicant recognises the heterogeneity issue and the implications for panel fields on slopes with gradients east/west or vice versa. It rightly links soil erosion with flow rate and recognises the flow rate effect on infiltration rate.	No	as outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.]**, additional measures such as berms and stone filter strips will be considered in Work Area 1 where slopes exceed 6 %.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Run off for all soil textures on a flat to 1% gradient creates a very slow runoff rate, the runoff rate for all textures except sands and loamy sands on a 2-6% gradient is medium. For sandy loams, sandy clay loams, loams, clay loams, silt loams, and silty clay loams, a gradient of 6-12% would produce rapid runoff.	No	This information is outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Every square metre of a flat open field (save any area in a tree rain shadow) will experience near identical rainfall levels and the same levels of saturation and infiltration. That will not be the case for a field of south facing fixed panels on an east/west slope. Work is underway to identify fields such as these within the proposals, along with soil type. This will also inform on whether these slopes discharge runoff into a level 3 flood zone area.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Applicant acknowledges that a part of the development will be located in level 3 flood zone areas.	Yes	The Development layout has been modified to remove aboveground infrastructure from the 1

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				% AEP + 39 % climate change outline.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Applicant then refers to paragraph 169 of the NPPF, stating that it deals with the move from sequential to exception test. Again unfortunately, it does not. However, there is no disagreement with the Applicant's conclusion in the FRA paragraph 130.	Yes	The NPPF was updated following the drafting of the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.]**. The paragraph references will be updated in the revised FRA.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	In terms of whether this proposal passes the sequential test, the Applicant cites the content of section 3 of TA A04.1 as the justification that no other sites of lower flooding risk are available.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Despite this, the Applicant still intends to develop in flood zones 2 and 3. These are situated in the River Trent flood plain. The section 3 mapping also classifies these same areas as "not preferred" on the basis that it would be expected that the ALC findings would demonstrate them to BMV land.	Yes	The Development design has been modified to avoid areas of flooding, where possible, including the River Trent floodplain

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Given the findings as demonstrated in Figure 1 of TA A04.1 which show the combined suitability factors for overall site selection as a heat map, the Applicant may struggle further down the line to pass the sequential test.	No	The Sequential Test outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.]** outlines how the Development has avoided flood zones where possible and an update will be provided in the ES.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	This scheme will still go ahead if a consent order is granted, with or without panels going into fields which are BMV land and flood zone 2 and 3.	Yes	Work Area 1: Solar PV has been removed from Flood Zones 2 and 3.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The development as a whole will contribute to the decarbonisation of energy supply infrastructure.	Yes	The carbon savings associated with the Development are set out in ES chapter 15, Climate Change **[EN010162/APP/6.2.15]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Community Benefit	It is the use of the word 'community' which may end up a sticking point.	No	The term "community", as used in that context, refers to the wider community that benefits from sustainability and climate change mitigation.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Biodiversity	Lastly, the Applicant might advance the argument that they intend to plant lots of trees and make landscape character improvements to improve bio-diversity. The difficulty with that position is that firstly virtually all the trees are required as mitigation measures.	No	Tree planting can both provide screening to mitigate and enhance landscape character, and it can biodiversity benefits. These multiple benefits require consideration in the assessment of effects as do the multiple adverse effects of aspects of the development.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	But more poignantly, it would be inconceivable for the Applicant to say something along the lines of "well if we are not allowed to develop in flood zones 2 or3, then there will not be the trees planted or landscape improvements made".	Yes	As identified in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** Work Area 3: Mitigation and Enhancement includes planting within Flood Zones 2 and 3.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Once more detail is provided regarding the RSuDS, no doubt further analyses will follow. But as matters stand at the moment, the Council are of the mind that the argument in planning policy to develop in flood zones 2 and has not been made.	No	The Sequential Test outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** outlines how the Development has avoided flood zones where possible and an update is provided in the ES.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	What will happen to the run off, levels of contamination, need for a Penstock?? (In the case of a BESS fire)	Yes	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , the SuDS features which will serve the BESS will serve dual function of attenuating surface water and in have the ability to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				contain spent fire-fighting water via the use of a penstock on the outfall of the structures.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Sutton on Trent, Carlton on Trent and many other villages in the area are rightly concerned about any development that increases the risk of local flooding.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	This is especially relevant at the moment as on multiple occasions in the recent past Sutton and Carlton on Trent have had significant flood events from pluvial waters originating from the surrounding catchment areas, which is where many of the proposed solar panels will be located.	No	It is acknowledged in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** that Sutton on Trent and Carlton on Trent have previously flooded. As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	At consultations held by the developer they maintain that under planting the panels with grass will slow surface water runoff and thus alleviate this problem.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]**, research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk	However, this is being treated with much scepticism by locals given the fact that the soil under many of the	No	The introduction of grassland to clay soils which are intensively

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	and drainage	proposed panels is clay based and has poor absorption rates at the best of times.		farmed will have a beneficial effect of increasing friction which runoff is subjected to and therefore slow the rate at which surface water is transferred to the wider hydrological environment.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Many panels will also be located on sloping land which will accelerate the concentrated runoff from panels meaning increased and more rapid flows towards the river.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , the topography within Work Area 1: Solar is generally sloping with 86.7% of the PEIR solar area located on slopes of less than 6%.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	This invariably results in a much higher risk of flooding especially when fluvial water levels are high which impedes surface water flow away.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	On two occasions last year the A1 trunk road was flooded by pluvial runoff from the surrounding fields and covering them in impermeable solar panels must surely increase the likelihood of this situation recurring.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The removal of panels from sloping fields would help to alleviate this problem.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , the topography within Work Area 1: Solar is generally gently sloping with 86.7% of the PEIR solar area located on slopes of less than 6%.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Flood Risk Management Team has reviewed the Flood Risk Assessment (Technical Appendix A9.1) and is broadly satisfied with its content.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	However, the reference to flood alleviation measures to improve the existing flooding pathways to communities such as Maplebeck is somewhat misleading.	Yes	The FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** acknowledges the intention to alleviate existing flooding problems through the NG+ fund and that this will be considered as a cumulative development and not part of the Development.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Whilst it is recognised that these schemes may be delivered within the order limits of this proposal, they would be secured separately through applications made to the LPA under the Town and Country Planning Act and will not be delivered directly as part of this development. Therefore, it is not recommended that these measures form part of the FRA for this application.	Yes	The FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** acknowledges the intention to alleviate existing flooding problems through the NG+ fund and that this will be considered as a cumulative development and not part of the Development.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Fire Chiefs Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Water run-off and potential impact on the environment, along with mitigation measures, should be considered and detailed in the Emergency Response Plan.	No	An emergency plan will detail how the water environment will be protected using lined SuDS features with a penstock on the outfall.
National Fire Chiefs Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Consideration should be given, within the site design, to the management of water run-off (e.g. drainage systems, interceptors, bunded lagoons etc).	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , the SuDS features which will serve the BESS will serve dual function of attenuating surface water and in have the ability to contain spent fire-fighting water via the use of a penstock on the outfall of the structures.
National Fire Chiefs Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	This should include systems for containing and managing water runoff.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , the SuDS features which will serve the BESS will serve dual

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				function of attenuating surface water and in have the ability to contain spent fire-fighting water via the use of a penstock on the outfall of the structures.
National Fire Chiefs Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Sites located in flood zones should have details of flood protection or mitigation measures.	Yes	Infrastructure in Work Area 1: Solar PV, Work Area 4: Substations and Work Area 5:a BESS is located entirely within Flood Zone 1.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	We believe that you intend to utilise vehicle cleaning methods within site compounds to reduce the amount of mud on the roads. This is a problem that we have seen previously during the construction of Egmanton Solar farm. Can you please confirm the commitment to keeping the roads clear from mud and other debris	No	The oCEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]** identifies measures to limit the potential for debris to be transferred to offsite roads, including wheel washing facilities.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Weston Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Has the flood risk assessment taken into account the impact of increased surface water runoff from the Solar Park into Moorhouse Beck on the fields either side of Great North Road and Bell Lane after heavy rainfall. The fields, Great North Road and Bell Lane areas flood on a regular basis after heavy rainfall.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	by removing vast areas of agricultural land with deep rooted hedges and crops facilitating drainage. By removing these we are adversely affecting flood risk…that is not to say that solar panels per se cause flooding.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Maplebeck Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Several residents raised the issue of flooding in Maplebeck. Parish chairman Roger Bell explained the proposals made by Elements Green to create a Natural Flood Defence Scheme. Some residents expressed their support for this to go ahead. However this was tempered by some skepticism from others who could not understand why it was the subject of a separate planning application and would not be part of the overall development consent order. This flood defence	Yes	Flood alleviation measures for several villages are being brought forward as separate entities from the Development.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		scheme was an absolute priority for the village to accept any development.		
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	This Parish is surrounded on 3 sides by water, the 4th side is water from a higher level flowing down towards the other 3 areas. Experience has taught us that from the last major flood in the area, the infrastructure put in place has served well for the last 50 years with flood water being kept away from both villages but it is still concerning as flooding incidents are on the increase.	No	Infrastructure in Work Area 1: Solar PV, Work Area 4: Substations and Work Area 5:a BESS is located entirely within Flood Zone 1.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Changes to landscape and other mitigation practices in areas close to this Parish will fundamentally change the way the current preventative measures work. For example, the inference that the plans for drainage in between rows of solar panels, will slow down the run-off of rainwater is questionable especially when water run-off is needed to be achieved as quickly as possible to avoid meeting the flood water coursing down the River Trent from higher up the river in other parts of Nottinghamshire and Derbyshire. The locks at Cromwell, where the river becomes tidal, is only 3 miles from this Parish and adding to the volume of water before that point when the river is already high due to water from further up river, has historically	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows, however where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		caused flooding. We have no confidence in the suggestions for drainage that have been submitted.		from the PV arrays therefore not contributing to or exacerbating existing flooding.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The proposed Battery Energy Storage System (BESS) site will be located on a Secondary A aquifer. The drainage at the BESS site may not sufficiently protect vulnerable controlled water receptors. Risk of firewater pollution to several sensitive water receptors. There are several abstractions in the vicinity of the proposed BESS site which are vulnerable to firewater pollution. The best practice for drainage strategies of BESS sites is to be designed based on a conceptual site model, which identifies all controlled water receptors. The Fire Safety Management Plan and/or Drainage Strategy should include a conceptual site model upon which the BESS drainage is designed.	No	As outlined in the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , the SuDS features which will serve the BESS will serve dual function of attenuating surface water and in have the ability to contain spent fire-fighting water by being lined and the use of a penstock on the outfall of the structures, limiting the potential for potentially contaminated water to be released to the hydrological environment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The potential contamination associated with the former RAF Ossington does not mention radium. Radium coatings were often used in aeroplane dials and occasionally, planes were buried on old RAF sites - so radium is a contaminant of concern. Inadequate assessment of potential contaminants at the site could lead to risks to groundwater not being identified. Include radium as a contaminant of concern for any site characterisation assessments of the former RAF Ossington within parcel 7. We disagree with the conceptual site model presented and request further assessment, Inadequate assessment of potential source-pathway-receptors linkages could lead to risks to groundwater not being identified. Reconsider the conceptual site model for land parcel 7 and the need for additional land contamination assessment. Groundwater has been disregarded as potential receptor, despite Land Parcel 7 overlying a Secondary A aquifer. A Source of pollution within Land Parcel 7 is the former RAF site located within the boundary. These receptors and sources should be included in the conceptual site model.	Yes	The conceptual site model for Study Area (Land Parcel) 7 has been amended to include Radium as a potential source of contamination and is included in a revised version of TA A10.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.10.7]**. The conceptual site model for Study Area (Land Parcel) 7 has been amended for inclusion in a revised version of TA A10.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.10.7]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Inappropriate watercourse crossings, culverted crossings for access and cable pipe (flume) for cable crossings are proposed. Culverts Impede flows and therefore may harm ecological processes and increase flood risk. The laying of cable pipes on the bottom of watercourses, as implied by the term "cable pipe (flume)" also impede waterflow and can potentially encourage scour and bed lowering. Cable/pipe bridges, during high flow/flood events, can potentially trap floating debris. Our policy is against the use of culverts. We support the opening up or removal of any existing culverts to further enhance watercourses. If it can be shown that culverts are necessary, and are the only viable options, then we expect the following regarding their design:• Arched or three sided, to avoid interference with the bed of the watercourse, and be of sufficient size to allow free passage of water • Box culverts should be avoided	No	As discussed with the EA in a meeting on 24/03/2025, cable crossings will utilise horizontal directional drilling (HDD) as the default option. Open trench methods will only be utilised on manmade watercourses / ditches and smaller watercourses (less than 2 m width). No pipe flumes will be used.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	For permanent crossings, clear-span bridges should be used, with abutments constructed away from the bank tops. Temporary access crossings should use "bailey" type bridges; this will avoid the need to work "in the dry" within the watercourses. Trenchless cable	No	Permanent crossings will be designed during the detailed design phase and will utilise a design which is commensurate

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		crossing methods, such as Horizontal Directional Drilling (HDD) are encouraged. Where trenched crossing methods are proposed, these should be conducted during dry periods to avoid the need for over-pumping		with the width and sensitivity of the watercourse.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The Pingley/Rundell Dyke is currently proposed to be crossed using open cut trenching techniques. Table 8.7 indicates that the Pingley and Beck is one of the larger and more natural watercourses; therefore open cut trenching may impact the current WFD good status. We recommend crossing using trenchless techniques. In addition, and with reference to the River Basin Management Plan (RBMP), you should investigate ways in which this watercourse could be enhanced.	Yes	HDD will be used to cross Pingley Dyke and the WFD assessment is updated to reflect this.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Any culverting of a watercourse or waterbody that contains fish can impact on lifecycle migration, both locally and long distance. Culverting also impacts fish habitat and spawning habitat by decreasing the quality of substrate. The long-term effects of culverting of watercourses could lead to a deterioration in WFD status. Culverting watercourses should be avoided at first, and where possible, be replaced by a full span crossing that maintains the natural substrate and	No	A list of watercourse crossings is included in the oCEMP (Technical Appendix A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and specifies the crossing method at each location. The potential effects of these

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		allows free fish passage. The ES and Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP)should include details of where any watercourse crossing will take place, and how they will be designed to ensure impacts on fish are negligible. Additional Information: Please refer to our comments above regarding Culverts (Chapter 5 Development Description and Chapter 9 Water Resources, Sections: 5.4.3.7, 9.6.1.2 and 9.6.1.3		watercourse crossings are assessed in ES Chapter 8 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**: Ecology and Biodiversity with reference to ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]**
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Flood risk to the BESS and substation site could be underestimated. The BESS and substation may be at a greater risk of flooding than initially considered. Furthermore, the placement of the BESS and substation could increase flood risk elsewhere if not properly mitigated. The overland flow routes shown in the Risk of Flooding from Surface Water mapping, particularly for the 0.1% (1 in 1000) AEP scenario should be reviewed. It appears the flood risk in this area is not from localised surface water ponding. This could be associated with some of the small ordinary watercourses which run close to the BESS. Any loss of floodplain for the design event should be compensated for on a level for level, and volume for volume basis.	No	Updated 1D-2D modelling has been undertaken to include an existing culvert under the A617, as outlined in the FRA (TA A9.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** . Updated results for the 1 % annual exceedance probability (AEP) + 39 % uplift for climate change (CC) shows that Works Area 5a and 5b are

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		The BESS and substation are located in Flood Zone 1. There are small ordinary watercourses which cross the BESS and substation site, these have no associated Flood Zone mapping due to the small size of their respective catchments. The Risk of Flooding from Surface Water (RoFSW) dataset shows the BESS area to be inundated in the 1% (1 in 100) annual exceedance probability scenario (AEP) and the 0.1% (1 in 1000) AEP scenario. In some locations within the BESS area, water depths fall within the 0.30 - 0.60 metre band for the 0.1% (1 in 1000) AEP scenario. Inspection of the RoFSW flow direction dataset, appears to show water flowing south and southeast through the BESS and substation area. It is noted that in section A9.1.2.3 page 41 of Technical Appendix A9.1: Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) that electrically sensitive infrastructure such as inverters will be located outside of the surface water flooding extents. It is also noted that further 2D modelling will be undertaken post-PEIR to confirm the area of pluvial flooding at risk in the 1% AEP plus climate change scenario. This is welcomed.		located outside the flood extent. Updated 2D direct rainfall modelling has also been undertaken for Work Area 5a and 5b. Results correlate well with the updated Risk of Flooding Surface Water (2025) dataset.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	This section notes that a sense check for fluvial flows will be undertaken for the credible maximum scenario. There are no details within the FRA, other than the reference to the higher central scenario for the 2080's epoch (plus 39%). It is not clear if the development would remain resilient and operational if upper climate change allowances were to materialise. Provide details within the FRA of the impact of a credible maximum scenario (upper fluvial flows) on the development. It should be demonstrated that the solar panels will remain operational should this scenario materialise. Furthermore, the BESS and substation should remain safe from flooding in this scenario.	No	Work Area 1: Solar PV is no longer located within the floodplain of the River Trent, including the 1 % AEP plus 39 % CC event. Only Work Area 2: Cables, Work Area 3: Mitigation and connections associated with Work Area 6 and Work Area 7 are located within the floodplain, however the works associated are either below ground (cables) or involve the creation of grassland etc which are compatible with the floodplain, will not result in a loss of storage or a perceptible effect on

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				conveyance and will remain operational.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The PEIR acknowledges the development will be operational between the 2050s and 2080's epochs. However, the design scenario that is proposed to be adopted for the development is the higher central scenario for the 2050's epoch. This reflects an uplift of 23% for the Lower Trent and Erewash management catchment. The FRA describes how the development would be decommissioned from 2069. Section A9.1.2.2.1.2 paragraph 83 of the FRA describes how given the time-limited nature of the application the use of a 30% climate change scenario is considered conservative and acceptable. The FRA notes that should there be a delay in the completion of construction of the development leading to operation into the 2080's the 39% allowance will be considered. The applicant has obtained model output data which includes the 1% (1 in 100) annual exceedance probability plus 39% water levels and depths (2080s higher central scenario).A review of this data confirms that water levels for the solar panels are not substantially increased when compared to the 1% (1 in	No	Paragraph 10 of the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** stated "the Development is Essential Infrastructure and will have a lifespan of 40 years (decommissioned from 2069)". The Development has been designed to avoid placing above ground infrastructure within the extent of the 1 % AEP + 39 % CC event i.e. the Higher central climate change allowance for the 2080s epoch. Given that a conservative approach has been adopted for the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		100) AEP plus 30% climate change scenario. Some difference mapping is presented in Plate A9.1.29 of the FRA. A review of the water level data for these scenarios confirms that water level differences between the 1% (1 in 100) AEP plus 30% and 1% (1 in 100) AEP plus 39% scenarios is small, with the highest increase being 0.25 m for the largest panel area just to the north of Little Carlton.		majority of the epoch in which the Development will operate in and the potential for climate change allowances to change in future, it is considered that the Development has been designed appropriately. The commitment in the oEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]** states that should the Development lifetime be anticipated to extend into the 2080s epoch, as a result of delays to the construction programme for example, then modelling will be undertaken in year 2069 using the appropriate

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				climate change allowances at the time, in consultation with the EA (and other regulators). Should modelling results show that the Development has the potential to interact with flood depths then the Development design will be altered accordingly to ensure that flood storage and conveyance is maintained for the River Trent. This could involve raising the PV Arrays (subject to negligible loss of storage and conveyance), the removal of the first row of panels on a PV table or removing the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				mounting system and associated infrastructure from the modelled extent.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The FRA has not clarified if the proposed lifetime of the development is the operational lifetime, or if it includes the construction and decommissioning phases. If the lifetime (including construction and decommissioning phase) is longer than proposed in the FRA, the project would extend into the 2080's climate change epoch. This can lead to an inadequate assessment of climate change flood risk. The FRA needs to clarify the timeline of the development and the complete lifetime. Additionally, delays should be factored into this assessment.	No	Paragraph 10 of the FRA **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** submitted with the PEIR stated "the Development is Essential Infrastructure and will have a lifespan of 40 years (decommissioned from 2069)". The Development has been designed to avoid placing above ground infrastructure within the extent of the 1 % AEP + 39 % CC event i.e. the Higher central climate change allowance for the 2080s epoch.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Given that a conservative approach has been adopted for the majority of the epoch in which the Development will operate in and the potential for climate change allowances to change in future, it is considered that the Development has been designed appropriately. The commitment in the oEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.5]** states that should the Development lifetime be anticipated to extend into the 2080s epoch, as a result of delays to the construction programme for example, then

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				modelling will be undertaken in year 2069 using the appropriate climate change allowances at the time, in consultation with the EA (and other regulators). Should modelling results show that the Development has the potential to interact with flood depths then the Development design will be altered accordingly to ensure that flood storage and conveyance is maintained for the River Trent. This could involve raising the PV Arrays (subject to negligible loss of storage and conveyance), the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				removal of the first row of panels on a PV table or removing the mounting system and associated infrastructure from the modelled extent.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The 1d-2d hydraulic modelling undertaken for the Car and Pingley Dyke suggests the BESS, and substation area, are not at risk from fluvial flooding from these watercourses, and the A617 acts as a barrier to flow. There could be some connectivity underneath the A617 at grid reference 475725, 355050. This could mean flood risk on the northeastern side of the A617, the BESS and substation is underestimated. The Detailed River Network (DRN) dataset suggests there is a small culvert underneath the A617 at grid reference 475725, 355050. Confirmation is required of any flow routes underneath the A617, and if there is a culvert underneath the A617 at grid reference 475725, 355050. If any culverts are present under the A617, these will need to be included within the 1d-2d linked model of the Car and Pingley Dyke. The outcome of	Yes	Updated 1D-2D modelling has been undertaken to include the existing culvert under the A617, as outlined in the FRA (TA A9.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** . Updated results for the 1 % AEP + 39 % CC shows that Works Area 5a and 5b are located outside the flood extent of Pingley Dyke.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		this assessment would be prudent to assess whether the flood flows from the River Greet and can pass under the A617.		
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	There is no evidence provided to demonstrate their will be no perceptible loss of flood storage or conveyance during times of flooding, from the solar panel metal support frames. The solar panel support frames could potentially increase flood risk due to loss of floodplain storage and impedance to flow. Where solar panel support frames fall within areas of fluvial flood risk, and specifically the design flood, the impact on flood risk to third parties should be quantified. This can be achieved using several different approaches. Firstly, the volume of floodplain lost could be calculated and presented within the Flood Risk Assessment (FRA). Alternatively, the impact of the solar panel mounting structures could be evaluated within the fluvial Trent hydraulic model. This can be completed using a 2d flow constriction layer or increasing the 2d floodplain roughness values.	Yes	Work Area 1: Solar PV has been removed from the floodplain and future floodplain (1 % AEP + 39 % CC), as shown on Plate A9.1.17 of the FRA (TA A9.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** . As such, there will be no effect on the conveyance of out of channel flows.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Soffit levels for new crossings are not considered. Potential impediments to flood flows, and therefore increased flood risk elsewhere. Any proposed crossings should be designed so the soffit level of any bridges sits above the design flood level. The design flood level for permanent crossings in this case would be the 1% (1 in 100) annual exceedance probability (AEP) plus higher central climate change scenario. The present day (without climate change) 1% (1 in 100) AEP scenario can be used for temporary crossings during the construction phase of the scheme. Careful consideration will need to be given to how the design flood level will be determined for the proposed crossings. Typically, this would be determined by undertaking hydraulic modelling, or referring to existing detailed hydraulic modelling data (where available). The production of the new Risk of Flooding from Rivers and Sea dataset (at the end of January 2025) may provide some useful information which may help inform crossing soffit levels. If a reliance is being placed on existing flood risk products, such as the mapping to inform soffit levels, then clear justification should be provided as to	No	Crossings will be designed following granting of the DCO and the oCEMP (TA A5.3) [**EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3**] has been updated at detailed design stage to commit to the soffit level of any bridges to sit above the design flood level. The design flood level for permanent crossings would be the 1% AEP plus Higher central climate change scenario (39 % CC) and will involve the following parameters: • Soffit height of the crossing will be a minimum of 600 mm above the 1 % AEP +

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		why this is a suitable proxy for representing fluvial flood risk; taking into consideration the effects of climate change. The proposed crossings should be designed to not increase flood risk elsewhere.		Climate change allowance flood level. • All abutments must be set back a minimum 1 m from the top of bank and as minimal as possible. • Any loss of floodplain due to abutments and ramps will need to be compensated for. • All parapets and railings need to be permeable and as open as possible with a minimum 100 mm spacing. The application is not seeking to disapply the EA's Protective Provisions and,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				therefore, the design of crossings will need to be approved by the EA prior to the constriction phase.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	It is proposed that new crossings will be bridges, but there is no clarification of the design criteria for these. If not designed appropriately, new structures could cause increases to flood risk. The applicant needs to provide design parameters for all new crossings. This should follow best practice: • Soffit height of the bridge must be a minimum of 600mm above the 1 in 100yrs + Climate change allowance flood level. • All abutments must be set back a minimum 1m from the top of bank and as minimal as possible. • Any loss of floodplain due to abutments and ramps will need to be compensated for. • All parapets and railings need to be permeable and open as possible with a minimum 100mm spacing. It is proposed to use existing crossings where possible - this is an approach we support.	No	Crossings will be designed following granting of the DCO and the oCEMP (TA A5.3) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** has been updated at detailed design stage to commit to the soffit level of any bridges to sit above the design flood level. The design flood level for permanent crossings would be the 1% AEP plus Higher central climate change scenario (39 % CC) and will involve the following parameters:

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				• Soffit height of the crossing will be a minimum of 600 mm above the 1 % AEP + Climate change allowance flood level. • All abutments must be set back a minimum 1 m from the top of bank and as minimal as possible. • Any loss of floodplain due to abutments and ramps will need to be compensated for. • All parapets and railings need to be permeable and as open as possible with a minimum 100 mm spacing.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				The application is not seeking to disapply the EA's Protective Provisions and, therefore, the design of crossings will need to be approved by the EA prior to the constriction phase.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	The development has not assessed the impact it may have on engineered flood defences and assets (engineered high ground). Consideration has not been given for access to maintain the assets and respond to emergency incidents. If assets are adversely impacted, this may lead to degradation and a lower standard of protection. If assets cannot be accessed in times of a flood and/or for maintenance, this can increase flood risk. There must be an assessment of the development's interactions and impacts on all flood defence assets within their site boundary. Additionally, access must be upheld and where possible improved to assets on site	Yes	ES Chapter 9, Water Resources **[EN010162/APP/6.2.9]** assessed the potential effects from the Development on flood defences, including those classed as Engineered High Ground and concluded effects of Negligible magnitude. Work Area 2: Cables has been removed from the Order Limits in proximity

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				to asset ID 55462 (Engineered High Ground) and asset ID 46099 (Natural High Ground) on the left bank of the River Trent. As such, the Development will not directly interact with flood defences and access to the assets will remain unaffected. An updated assessment of the potential effects from the Development on flood defences is provided in Section 9.6.1.6 of the ES Chapter.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Both the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) scoping and Preliminary Environmental Impact Reports (PEIR) have not considered water supply for consumptive uses in sufficient detail, for any phase of the project. With the exception of dust suppression, the	Yes	As discussed with the EA on 24/03/2025 and 14/04/2025, water for use by the Development during all stages will be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		source of supply for water to meet the projects demands is unclear. Consumptive uses such as dust suppression, HDD, concrete production and washing are identified in the project description. A comprehensive breakdown of water demands and options appraisal of potential sources of supply may expedite permitting requirements. Identifying any impacts or obstacles early may help to identify practical solutions affecting scheme design or operation. Bentonite clay mixing and driving of HDD may require a significant volume of water and a continuous supply. We encourage early engagement with the water company to establish the security of any supply intended to come from them.		procured offsite i.e. not by groundwater abstraction and sourced by means such as rainwater harvesting, tankered, potable supply etc. As sheep grazing is proposed to manage the grassland in Work Area 1 there will be a need to supply them with drinking water. Based on a total flock of 9,600 sheep this equates to 18.7 m3 per day, which is less than the threshold where a licence is required from the EA. The oCEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** has been updated to reflect this and this

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				addresses the EA's point.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Dust suppression techniques requiring water are intended to be supplied by drainage water or from local watercourses. The report acknowledges the need for a licence to abstract water for this activity. However, it does not explore the potential implications for this in the Water Resources or in the Climate Change chapters. The project demands for water may impact local water resource receptors during prolonged dry weather and drought. There is relatively good surface water availability in the Trent and Erewash catchment (more information can be found in the Catchment Abstraction Licensing Strategy). However, it is most likely that any licence issued will have conditions whereby abstraction must cease during periods of low flow. The scheme may wish to consider some on site storage of water to buffer times of unavailability. At the peak of the summer, or during periods of prolonged dry weather and drought, water will not be available for purposes such as dust suppression which will have a higher demand during these periods	Yes	As discussed with the EA on 24/03/2025 and 14/04/2025, water for use by the Development during all stages will be procured offsite i.e. not by groundwater abstraction and sourced by means such as rainwater harvesting, tankered, potable supply etc.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	There is mention of the quality of the rivers ranging from Moderate to Bad, but no detail is provided of what cycle of WFD classifications this has come from. Use of improper classifications can lead to a misunderstanding of the baseline WFD water quality in the area. Confirmation needs to be provided of the source of the WFD classifications.	No	Section 9.4.7 of the ES clarifies that the WFD classifications are derived from Cycle 3 – 2022.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Settlement Lagoons causing silt pollution. Discharge containing elevated levels of suspended solids may cause a deterioration in a waterbody's WFD status. Inspect the discharge during wet weather/pumping and record outcomes in a site diary/photograph. Sample the discharge from settlement lagoons/silt busters/pumped discharges to surface watercourses. Provide a monitoring plan for the sampling of discharges (frequency and determinants to be analysed). Consider lining the sides of settlement lagoons to prevent the erosion of banks. This will help to reduce the amount of suspended solids that require settling.	Yes	The oCEMP (TA A5.3) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** has been updated to include water quality monitoring of discharges from settlement lagoons, specifically during wet weather.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk	Water quality monitoring requires more details. Surface water run-off, or pumped site drainage, to local watercourses may cause a deterioration in a	Yes	The oCEMP (TA A5.3) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** has been updated to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	and drainage	waterbody's WFD status. Details of the monitoring programme need to include monitoring locations and frequency before, and during the development. This needs to be submitted prior to commencing work on site. Details of the proposed analysis suites are to also be provided. Twice monthly samples need to be collected prior to work commencing (obtain 12 samples over a 6-month period). We suggest that weekly sampling occurs once construction commences, with the view to this reducing to twice monthly after a period of time, based on the results of samples obtained. This would be with the agreement of the local Environment Officer. Results of samples to be provided monthly to the East Midlands Water Quality email inbox eastmidwaterquality@environment-agency.gov.uk. Monitoring should also include visual inspections carried out during the construction phase and how these will be recorded. Visual inspections are to be carried out during wet weather, and to include periods when the site is not operational, due to wet weather		reflect the suggested sampling frequency and provision of results.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	An outdated WFD classification is used (cycle 2, 2019). An inappropriate understanding of the WFD baseline may lead to an inappropriate assessment of the development's impacts, and mitigation measures. An up-to-date WFD assessment should use Cycle 3, 2022 WFD classifications, which may differ from those seen in 2019, along with the associated reasons for not achieving good status (RNAGs) and RBMP objectives	No	Section 9.4.7 of The ES clarifies that the WFD classifications are derived from Cycle 3 – 2022.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	We request the following requirement is input:• (1) the authorised development must be carried out in accordance with the flood risk assessment, including mitigation measures detailed in it, so that part of the authorised development is predicted to result in any exceedance of the flood levels to properties and land shown in the flood risk assessment.	No	Noted and is subject to requirements.
Environment Agency	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	A water discharge activity permit may be required for the temporary discharge of site drainage to surface waters. Please see Temporary dewatering from excavations to surface water: RPS 261 - GOV.UK for further information. The use of flocculants to treat site drainage will require approval from the Environment Agency as part of a water discharge activity permit application. A water abstraction licence may be	No	Permits will be applied for prior to the construction phase.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		required if more than 20 cubic metres of water a day is abstracted. Please refer to Apply for a water abstraction or impounding licence - GOV.UK for further information.		
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Construction of excellent quality access roads at minimum width and with suitable drainage and sediment controls. This may include nonpermeable membrane to prevent weed damage or laying tracks and roadways that work with the land such as timber mats or road mats which allow vegetation to grow through and minimise the initial impact of laying a solid roadway.	No	The oCEMP (TA A5.3) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** outlines how tracks will be constructed, including drainage measures.
Nottinghamshire Wildlife Trust (NWT)	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Environmental monitoring surveys on water and soil to ensure they are being managed appropriately during the construction period. Water monitoring usually focuses upon sediment control.	No	The oCEMP (TA A5.3) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** outlines the commitment to monitor water quality during the construction phase of the Development to monitor the effectiveness of measures to limit the potential for chemical

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				pollution and sedimentation.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	As Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) are the Lead Local Flood Authority (LLFA) and also a 'host' local authority, we have agreed that they will provide a response on this chapter. Accordingly, NSDC have no specific comments to make.	Yes	The ES and supporting information will take cognisance of the NCC response.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	We will leave Nottinghamshire County Council (NCC) to comment on the Land Drainage Act.	No	Noted.
Natural England	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Section 8.5.2 para 38 states that no other IRZ triggers within the Order Limits include the development category of 'Wind and Solar Energy'. Nonetheless, NE welcome consideration of impacts to Laxton Sykes SSSI due to the potential of direct hydrological connectivity.	No	Potential effects on designations are considered within the Ecology and Water Resources chapters of the ES.
Natural England	Hydrology, flood risk and drainage	Potential hydrological connectivity to the SSSI from Hagley's Dumble and The Beck has been identified in para 163 of Section 8.8.4.1. NE advise that the CEMP should specifically address potential water pollution pathways and impacts in this area of development. NE consider the use of best practise pollution prevention	No	Measures to limit the potential for adverse effects on the hydrological environment are outlined in the oCEMP TA A5.3)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		measures to most likely be suitable to avoid any adverse impacts on the SSSI		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** .
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	Consent will only be granted for the increase in flow to a watercourse where the Board is happy that in doing so no demonstrable harm will be caused. It may be the case that appropriate mitigations are required to be put in place to either attenuate flow or to enhance the existing watercourse to ensure no detriment. If this is not possible alternative outfall locations may need to be considered.	No	Noted.
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	No person without the previous consent of the Board shall erect any building or structure, whether temporary or permanent, or plant any tree, shrub, willow or other similar growth within nine metres of the landward toe of the bank where there is an embankment or wall or within nine metres of the top of the batter where there is no embankment or wall, or where the watercourse is enclosed within nine metres of the enclosing structure. This will relate primarily to any above ground installations and their proximity to any Board maintained watercourses.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	The Board will require all watercourses to be crossed by means of an appropriate trenchless method at a depth no less than 2 metres PLUS the safe working distance below the hard bed level of all watercourses (to ODN if EA or IDB maintained). The purpose of this requirement is to allow the IDB to maintain and have the flexibility to improve watercourses in the future due to climate change (works will include deepening & widening of watercourses).	No	Cable crossings will utilise horizontal directional drilling (HDD) as the default option. Open trench methods will only be utilised on manmade watercourses / ditches and smaller watercourses (less than 2 m width). No pipe flumes will be used. Regarding culverting, clear span bridge crossings will be used where possible and culverts will only be used where a bridging solution is not feasible i.e. field drains / ditches / smaller watercourses (less than 2 m width).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	Any culverting or other works within the bed of any Board maintained watercourse be they temporary or permanent will require consent. It will usually be assumed that these structures will be temporary measures to accommodate haul roads etc.	No	Regarding culverting, clear span bridge crossings will be used where possible and culverts will only be used where a bridging solution is not feasible i.e. field drains / ditches / smaller watercourses (less than 2 m width).
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	It is anticipated that the above requirements would be covered by SOCGs, MOU, and via Protective Provisions within the DCO. This matter should be discussed further and in more detail as the proposed route is refined.	No	Noted.
Trent Valley Internal Drainage Board	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	Any culverting or other works within the bed of any riparian watercourse within the Board's district or extended area, be they temporary or permanent will also require consent.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council (Appended to NSDC Response)	Hydrology, Flood Risk and Drainage	Carlton on Trent was impacted by storm Babet with properties being evacuated in October 2023. Many were then affected by storm Henk in January 2024 and houses were not habitable until October 2024 or later. Consequently, the biggest fear is that swathes of solar panels will affect the run off of surface water and exacerbate existing issues or create new flood risks.	No	As outlined in Technical Appendix A9.1 Flood Risk Assessment (FRA) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.9.1]** , research outlines that solar panels do not have a significant effect on runoff volumes or peak flows; however, where ground beneath panels is bare there may be an increase in peak discharge. Grassland under the PV arrays will act to bind the soil and slow the flow of water from the PV arrays.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The scale and magnitude of the solar farm, including infrastructure comprising site storage facilities, perimeter fencing, and the need for CCTV columns, will cumulatively impact the character of landscape areas. The fact that a Landscape strategy is required to screen the development demonstrates that there will	No	Significant landscape and visual effects are to be expected from a solar farm of this scale. Effects on landscape character are considered

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		undoubtedly be harm to the landscape character. The scale and broad spread of development with associated infrastructure would result in an urbanising form of development that does not achieve the policy requirements to conserve the area's landscape character. The area would be highly susceptible to the changes, and sensitivity will be higher in some locations and would remain so for at least 10 years (25% of its operational life) whilst any landscape mitigation establishes and matures.		in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The planting of an additional 50,000 trees and the laying of 46km of hedgerows is welcomed. However, to provide mitigation from the commencement of the proposals, there needs to be a mix of different tree standards and not solely reliant on the planting of young saplings. In key viewpoints, more substantial trees should be planted from the offset. There needs to be a landscape strategy that provides enhancements from the outset, with planting of mature trees to assist with assimilating the development from an early stage, whilst alleviating the harms to the outlook of the closet residents.	No	A mix of stock sizes are proposed; however, the use of larger stock does not necessarily provide faster mitigation of effects as larger plants are typically more difficult to establish.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
North Muskham Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	The PC are concerned regarding the cumulative impacts of GNR both individually (due to its excessive size), and collectively as a solar development but also as part of the overall provision and existence of industrialisation in the countryside, including utlities, transport and mineral extraction within the immediate Muskham area and indeed across the Trent Valley and Nottinghamshire.	No	Cumulative effects on landscape character with existing and proposed developments is provided in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
North Muskham Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The visual landscape of Newark and Sherwood is a key aspect of our community's identity.	Yes	Effects on landscape and visual receptors are considered in chapter 7 of the ES, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
North Muskham Parish Council	Landscape and visual	There will be significant visual amenity impact from many vantage points in North Muskham. This impact will be particularly great when travelling between North Muskham and Bathley and South Muskham.	No	For clarity, it is assumed that this relates to effects within the Parish. Visual effects on the settlement of North Muskham would be limited by the noise fence alongside the A1 as identified in the PEIR

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				chapter 7. Design changes to avoid areas of higher flood risk have removed most of the solar areas within and close to the parish and as a result visual effects will also reduce.
North Muskham Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The impact on residents should not be underestimated when considering the overall development.	No	Visual effects on residents are considered in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**, and in the Residential Visual Amenity Assessment for the closest homes.
North Muskham Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	Our countryside is going to be industrialised by the development of largescale solar farms. Continuous rows of glass panels completely alter landscape character and boundaries are changed by security fencing and the intrusion of CCTV.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	This largescale conversion from open fields to solar arrays has disastrous consequences for the nature of the landscape and the local identity. Solar panels dramatically alter the nature and views of the countryside and the key features that punctuate it.	No	Significant landscape and visual effects are to be expected from a solar farm of this scale. Effects on landscape character are considered in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	Fields 577, 153 and 154 in particular are on north facing slopes and the impact of solar panels would be seen for many kilometres in a north/south direction.	No	Whilst distant visibility may be possible, visibility to the north of this area is restricted to occasional areas of higher ground as shown by Figure 7.1 (ZTV study **[EN010162/APP/6.3.7.1]**), and effects would be expected to reduce to negligible beyond approximately 1.5km.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	The enclosure of rural footpaths change them into sterile walkways rather than vantage points for appreciation of heritage assets and rural vistas. The planned hedging exacerbates rather than mitigates the loss of such views.	Yes	The design and assessment of landscape and visual effects takes account of the point that the loss of open views, even where due to hedging, can be an adverse impact.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	Continuous rows of glass panels completely alter landscape character whilst security fencing and the intrusion of CCTV destroys the peace and tranquillity.	No	Significant landscape and visual effects are to be expected from a solar farm of this scale. Effects on landscape character are considered in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	Removal of the identified fields will ease the will effects this solar park will undoubtedly have to residents and visitors, with key rights of way retaining the more suitable original vistas.	Yes	The suggested amendment would mitigate effects for a short section of footpath, but also involves the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				removal of a notable area of solar panels and would not represent an exceptional circumstance where a minor reduction in function which would give rise to a significant benefit as required by in NPS EN-1.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The Council accept that the purpose of the RVAA is to identify dwellings which may be subject to such a magnitude of change that the adverse impact could mean that the threshold has been reached. To that end and applying the 250m cut-off, the RVAA concentrated on just 26 properties. It then applies the criteria to arrive at an assessment as to whether the impact is major adverse and therefore to be assessed in the ES. What is clear from any of the figures is that dwellings experiencing a medium magnitude of change are capable of being subject to Major Adverse effects. ... It identified 142 dwellings within the study area, 26 worthy of assessment and a further 53 which would be	No	This interpretation of the RVAA is incorrect. As set out at paragraph A7.6.3.2 of Appendix 7.6 Residential Visual Amenity Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]** , guidance indicates that only those properties where effects are of the highest magnitude require detailed consideration. The level

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		affected. In each of these 53, the report does not differentiate whether the magnitude of change would be medium or low. So potentially, there could be up to 53 dwellings which would experience a major or major moderate adverse effect.		of effects (i.e. whether effects are Major or Major/moderate) is not relevant to the RVAA.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The Applicant's methodology as to whether to choose a property for RVAA assessment is apparently only desk based.	No	The RVAA undertaken at PEIR stage was based on a combination of desk analysis and site observations from public areas close to the properties, as required by guidance. Further site work will inform the ES stage assessment.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	It identified 142 dwellings within the study area, 26 worthy of assessment and a further 53 which would be affected. In each of these 53, the report does not differentiate whether the magnitude of change would be medium or low. So potentially, there could be up to 53 dwellings which would experience a major or major moderate adverse effect.	No	Residential Visual Amenity Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]** , guidance indicates that only those properties where effects are of the highest magnitude require detailed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				consideration. The level of effects (i.e. whether effects are Major or Major/moderate) is not relevant to the RVAA.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The methodology is clear that it is only really concerned with any individual property with the potential to reach the threshold. That is the purpose of the RVAA. The LVIA methodology makes it clear that the LVIA will not address any residential impacts or effects.	No	This is a correct understanding of the scope of the RVAA and LVIA.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	As it is a PEIR that has been submitted, the Applicant has stated that a full Residential Amenity Assessment has not been provided but that will follow in due course, after consultation. Only then will we know what are the significant adverse effects on the wider local population, including which individual houses are likely to to be impacted by a major or major moderate adverse effect. It is hoped that that assessment will include properties affected by the additional field number 603 at Staythorpe.	No	Field 603 is within the Order Limits, but not for above ground development. Works in these fields will not require consideration in the RVAA.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The RVAA and LVIA have concentrated their attention on the 26 described properties, solely focussing on the threshold test and providing generalisations for everywhere else. But an assessment of the 'big picture' is surely what is required during consultation.	No	The RVAA and LVIA scope do not need to be varied for consultation purposes.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	One of the important features of this design is large scale tree planting. It is important to identify the purpose of this intention.	No	Tree planting is included in the design for the ecological and landscape benefits it provides, to enhance landscape character and to provide screening. It does not have a single purpose.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	In other words, tree and hedgerow planting performs two functions in that they mitigate views and are also beneficial enhancements. In other words, tree and hedgerow planting performs two functions in that they mitigate views and are also beneficial enhancements. Enhancements are proposals that are not required to mitigate adverse effects, so they can be counted as scheme benefits. Clearly, double-counting mitigation measures as enhancements has implications for	No	The EIA process is not a matter of 'counting' effects, mitigation measures or enhancements. The function is to describe the likely significant effects. Some elements of the Proposed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		judgements about levels of effects, since real enhancements / scheme benefits could potentially outweigh levels of harm. Because the PEIR and supporting documentation has erroneously assumed that landscape / visual mitigating measures can be double-counted as landscape / visual enhancements, it has overestimated levels of beneficial effects, and underestimated levels of adverse effects.		Development may give rise to multiple different effects (which may be positive, neutral or adverse) - all of which need to be described. Proposed planting forms part of the development; in some instances, its primary purpose is visual mitigation, but the positive effects arising (for instance in terms of landscape character and/or ecology) still require description, as would any adverse effects arising from that planting.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	GLVIA3 makes it clear throughout- effects on character and views must be assessed separately, especially because effects on character can occur even if there would be no views of the change. If landscape character and visual effects are conflated, then levels of effects on character are assumed to be lower than they would actually be.	No	ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** considers landscape and visual effects separately.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The Council would wish that the Environmental Statement (ES) corrects these elements of LVIA planning assertions.	No	There is no correction to be made.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The Works area maps provided by the Applicant label all the green areas as "Work area 3 Mitigation". This in reinforced by the the Zones of Theoretical Visibility (ZTV) differences in the Volume 3 mapping showing before and after mitigation visibility.	Yes	Figures 7.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.7.6]** and 7.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.7.7]** both illustrate visibility before mitigation. The difference between them is that the scale of effect is illustrated before mitigation (7.6) and after mitigation. A note will be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				added to Figure 7.7 to make this clearer.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The Applicant acknowledges there will be a multitude of significant adverse effects.	No	Significant adverse landscape and visual effects are to be expected for a solar farm of this scale.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	There are a limited number of actual enhancements suggested by the PEIR.	No	Landscape enhancement is not required by policy but refer to Landscape and Ecology Masterplan (LEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** to view enhancement proposals.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	To justify the adverse impacts, the Applicant describes the benefits.	No	ES Chapter Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** describes both positive and adverse effects, and mitigation and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				enhancement measures. The purpose of the LVIA is purely to describe the effects, not to justify them.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	To provide one pertinent example for this proposal, the occupant of the dwelling by field 97 near Norwell Woodhouse, in a bid to prevent his house being surrounded on all four sides by panels, has suggested to the Applicant that the size of field 98 be reduced.	Yes	A design change has been made to field 98 to reduce the extent of panels near to this home.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	One of the key functions of this large scale planting is to mitigate the adverse visual impacts of the infrastructure. The thought process here is that if a resident is going to lose a view across open fields, then better that view be blocked by woodland close up rather than industrial infrastructure. That probably is true but it is still a significant loss of amenity.	No	For the most part, woodland is not proposed close to homes for this reason and screening would be provided by hedges.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	One of the Applicant's staff told an elderly resident (whose house was initially to be surrounded on all four side by panels) it should take 10-15 years for trees to mature enough to hide the panels.	No	The time taken for planting to achieve will vary depending on the relative location and elevation of the house and solar panels.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	What would not be acceptable is where any resident whose visual impacts were to be mitigated is approached with the suggestion – "mitigation planting has fallen behind but it might be in your best interests to help out with the planting if we show you how."	No	This is not a scenario which would arise. Planting will be an integral part of the design, secured through the DCO.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The second set of security measures is the planned fencing. The Applicant plans to use deer fencing. In some respects this is preferable as the visual impact of security fencing is much higher.	No	This is the rationale behind the selection of deer fencing which is more in keeping with the rural environment and less visually intrusive.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Landscape and visual	Any glint and glare from a distance of over 200m may not lead to any ocular harm. But in open countryside with rolling topography, it is still leads to a visual impact and should not be ignored.	No	ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** LVIA takes account of glint and glare as part of the nature of views of a solar farm.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and visual	Due to the size of the proposed solar farm the accumulative impact will be significant.	No	Cumulative landscape and visual effects are assessed in the ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and visual	Elements Green have offered minimum mitigation in some areas by recommending screening by planting hedges - also recognising that this will take several years to establish.	No	There is no minimum standard of mitigation. Hedges are generally used as this screens solar panels in the majority of views but does not shade them. Tree planting is proposed it would improve mitigation and where shading would not arise.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	Elements Green have created some visualisations for the area of Carlton-on-Trent however concern was raised that these do not show how significant the	No	Not all open views of the Proposed Development are represented, but all effects will be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		impact would be when viewed from other frequently used locations.		considered. This is normal practice in LVIA where viewpoints are selected to be representative rather than exhaustive. Some of the additional viewpoints proposed by CoTPC will be included in the final LVIA.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	No mock-up visualisation gives a true representation of the visual impact, wirelines are a particularly poor way to represent and demonstrate impact.	No	The primary purpose of the wirelines is to inform technical consultees and assessors. Some photomontages will be provided as part of the final LVIA.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	We believe all visualisations, especially those of Carlton-on-Trent, should be repeated as photomontages.	No	A mix of wirelines (for more distant views) and photomontages will be used to inform the final assessment. The use of photomontages

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				throughout would be disproportionate and is not standard practice.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	Furthermore, it is noted that the use of wireline is not an accurate way to represent and demonstrate impact.	No	The wirelines are accurate but do require more interpretation than photomontages.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	We ask that visualisations are extended to include the following to inform and alleviate concerns the Parish Council wish these to be included: View from FP looking toward C-o-T, gateway near common farm looking towards C-o-T, FP near the grange looking towards C-o-T, view from gateway looking east to C-o-T across the fields, full view of locality, popular place to stop due to historical asset, full view required, looking from Besthorpe Nature Reserve, two views looking 275 degrees W looking over the gates towards C-o-T.	Yes	two of the suggested locations will; be included in the final LVIA.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The significant visual and adverse impact of turning 7000 acres of what is currently farmland into an industrial landscape, the size of a large town, containing regimentally aligned solar panels should not be underestimated.	No	The landscape and visual impacts will be fully assessed.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and visual	More so, residents that currently have a direct and picturesque view of the countryside, specifically MOST residents of Carlton on Trent whose properties reside on the western side of the main road through the village, will have their beautiful view of the rural landscape significantly and adversely impaired.	No	Changes to views from homes are considered as part of the RVAA for those properties within 250m of the Proposed Development.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	The removal of panels on sloping fields as mentions in (a) above will also help to reduce the size of the development and also the visual impact.	Yes	This design principle has been followed where possible as can be noted in the Design Approach Document **[EN010162/APP/5.6]**
Forestry Commission	Landscape and Visual	Direct impacts can include, but are not limited to, damaging or compacting soil, damaging functional habitat connections and changing the woodland ecosystem by removing the woodland edge or thinning trees. Indirect impacts can also include increasing the	No	Effects to woodland are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		amount of dust, light, air or soil pollution and changing the landscape character of the area.		
National Highways	Landscape and visual	The study area provided in the glint and glare assessment indicates that the majority of effects will not be significant. b. Some of the receptor locations identified in the LVIA within their study area have the potential to retain views of the site for a number of years which may occur outside of the study area identified within the Glint and Glare assessment. c. Receptor locations should be cross-checked to see those located within the LVIA study area could be affected.	No	Noted. The potential for glint and glare to be seen in views of the solar panels is taken account of in the LVIA.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	from a visual perspective the other arrays within this land parcel also present a possible visual impact upon the residents, Notably DB031.	Yes	Solar panels have been set back slightly in DB031 to mitigate effects on the adjacent home.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	The residents have concerns relating to the visual impact of the solar arrays upon the local environment to the south and south east of our location that we feel would dramatically alter the character of the landscape for resident and rights of way users.	Yes	Effects on views and landscape character in this area have been assessed in the LVIA.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	Several residents also raised with Elements Green a request to supplement the treelined area separating Moorhouse Road and DB032 with additional trees to infill the entrance to this field in order to present an unbroken view of the treeline rather than a gap of which the solar arrays would be visible all year around. We understand that this will now be left open for the construction and maintenance traffic as things stand	No	Moving the site access would require the felling of trees or removal of hedgerows in order to create a new gap elsewhere and the view into the field is only visible when passing on the adjacent road. The same would be true of any new site entrance.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	It should be acknowledged visual amenity does play a large part in people's choices on where they choose to live, the peace, tranquillity and character of the village farmlands, intersected with meadowlands over the Moorhouse valley from the vantage point of Hagg Lane and does indeed present a unique view for many Rights of Way users as well as residents.	Yes	Effects on views from Hagg Lane are considered in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. Changes made to the design of the area to the east (supplementing the existing tree belt) will reduce visibility of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Proposed Development from Hagg Lane as will the reduction in the northward extent of fields to the south (formerly area DB031). This will mean that the proposed tree belt is also further south and uphill, providing more screening in views from the north.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	We acknowledge the developer has removed a moderate amount of solar array from the Moorhouse valley area since the projects design inception which will undoubtedly lessen the visual impact from Hagg Lane's perspective. However, we still have concerns relating to the arrays that remain. Several arrays are prevalent to our location. Namely DB032 and DB031. Whilst other arrays may also be visible in the distance it is impossible to gauge how observable they will be on the extents. We also note many of the further arrays	Yes	Effects on views from Hagg Lane are considered in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. Changes made to the design of the area to the east (supplementing the existing tree belt) will

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		are in shadow of DB032 and the treeline that borders this array adjacent to Moorhouse Road.		reduce visibility of the Proposed Development from Hagg Lane as will the reduction in the northward extent of fields to the south (formerly area DB031). This will mean that the proposed tree belt is also further south and uphill, providing more screening in views from the north.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	Solar Array DB031, This array will be permanently viewable to a large degree for the entirety of the project's lifecycle due to the ground topology. We don't believe the proposed new woodland planting will provide any benefit in screening the development from our location due to the incline of the sloped land. At least the top two thirds of the development will be permanently viewable. As the panels will be south facing and at indeterminate (at this stage) height, it is difficult to understand the prospective visual impact of	Yes	Effects on views from Hagg Lane are considered in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. Changes made to the design of the area to the east (supplementing the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the development when viewed from behind, seeing the supporting structure, cabling and other technical infrastructure that is generally hidden below the panels themselves. We welcome the developer's commitments to reinstalling the surrounding wooded zone bordering the road, which was in the plan at inception, briefly removed following stage 1 consultation and then re-established for stage 2 consultation. Although this will provide no screening benefit from our perspective. Given the order limits tightly bound the north side of this array and the field orientation the only way to provide more screening from our perspective, would be removal of the array from the scheme.		existing tree belt) will reduce visibility of the Proposed Development from Hagg Lane as will the reduction in the northward extent of fields to the south (formerly area DB031). This will mean that the proposed tree belt is also further south and uphill, providing more screening in views from the north.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	Solar Array DB032 This array will be the closest array to Hagg Lane and Gypsy Lodge and will be viewable to a large extent from both locations. Particularly in the winter months when the existing tree's bordering Moorhouse Road are without leaves. Of particular note is the planned Site Access 24 which splits the screening trees by approximately fifteen metres allowing in a large visible slice of the south facing solar	Yes	The existing tree belt alongside Moorhouse Road is proposed to be supplemented with an additional hedge to provided further screening in winter. Moving the site access

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		array, as well as those further behind in the periphery. At stage 1 consultation, several residents privately requested the field entrance (we now understand services a prospective building compound, access 24) be further screened with trees across this entrance. Solar Array DB032, Mitigation.1 We have made several prior references within this document to moving this compound and entrance to alternative entrances from Great North Road and we consider doing this (and for a number of previously stated reasons) will allow additional screening permanently across the entrance, dramatically reducing the visual impact from this gap in the existing screening. Mitigation.2 In lieu of the access being moved to Great North Road, would the developer consider moving the entrance to the compound down to the south end of the bordering trees to the corner of the array where the impact of an entrance would be much less, from a visual perspective? Mitigation.3 Finally, if no changes to the site compound entrance are feasible, would the developer commit to		would require the felling of trees or removal of hedgerows in order to create a new gap elsewhere and the view into the field is only visible when passing on the adjacent road. The same would be true of any new site entrance. Illustrative construction compounds are shown in the illustrative construction design Figure 5.5 Illustrative Construction Layout **[EN010162/APP/6.3.5.5]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		supplementary planting of additional screening around the entrance to narrow the entrance during the operational phase, where large vehicular access is no longer required? Although we consider this the least desirable outcome, any improvement will be welcomed		
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	Solar Array DB032, At stage 1 consultation residents privately raised concerns relating to winter screening of this array given the current modest screening in all seasons but particularly during the winter months. As at the time of writing this document, there are no leaves and a view of the field, which will house the prospective array, is clearly visible. The responses from the developer suggested that this could be supplemented as required. However, we note that a 15m exclusion zone of what would appear to be grassland has been included. This exclusion zone would seem to have been included, more from a tree root protection requirement as opposed to a screening requirement. What, exactly is planned to be achieved and planted within this proposed boundary. We would request an additional boundary hedge between the existing Moorehouse treeline and the array, or supplemental planting of more growth in the existing	Yes	An additional hedge will be provided 'inside' the existing tree belt at the west edge of DB032 where it adjoins Moorhouse Road.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		treeline, whichever is more appropriate. The planting should incorporate species that either stay green year-round or form a more dense		
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	Northern Boundary Supplemental Planting / Right of Way Access; you still intend to bolster the hedging on the north face of this array, given that presently it can hardly be called a hedge, more a series of individual small trees at intervals of several metres, which provides no screening at all. new hedging will separate the amended footpath from the solar array, which we agree with. Given the scale of the map and its markings it is difficult to ascertain if this is the intention. Can you please confirm the new hedging will separate the arrays from the relocated footpaths	No	The new hedges will separate the solar panels from footpaths - this is a design approach used throughout the Proposed Development.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	We also note your commitment to re-routing the footpath NT/Weston/FP10 around the periphery of the development as previously requested	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	It's disappointing the published representative viewpoints and visualisations indicated within Figure 7.5 show representative views that are simply too far away from the development to have any significant benefit such as that from Tuxford (Point 40). Whilst local views of the northernmost solar arrays DB031/32 have been omitted. Indeed, any significant views from the highest point at Hagg Lane to the south/east would have been beneficial, indicating the significant views over the Moorhouse valley. Whilst we appreciate there has been a modest description (recounted below) we feel the old adage of "a picture tells a thousand words" is more appropriate. The closest representative viewpoint is from Moorhouse itself (Point 13). Unfortunately, the views supplied only cover the lower valley area, most of which cannot be viewed from Hagg Lane due to the topology of the landscape. Whilst we understand the viewpoints are not indicative of individual visual receptors, we feel a significant portion of the northernmost development has been under-represented. We would ask that the developer considers more representative images as indicated above.	Yes	A viewpoint has been added on Hagg Lane.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	The following statements, although made from the perspective of rights of way and road users, support our residential concerns relating to the visual impacts from our location, although we dispute the characterisation of "small scale" or similar statements. "[273] To the northeast of Moorhouse, Large scale changes to views would continue to arise from the existing and diverted routes south and west of Ladywood Farm which would pass adjacent to panel areas. Small scale changes to views would arise from the bridleway and footpath near Egmanton Common Farm where there would be elevated views towards the solar panels on facing slopes south of Moorhouse, backed by woodland. Other PRoW northwest and west of Moorhouse would have limited or no visibility of the Development.""[274] Considered together, Medium-term changes to views from PRoW in this area would be Large to Medium scale for a Wide extent of the PRoW network. The magnitude of impact would be Large/medium and effects would be Major/moderate, Adverse and significant. "[276] Road users on Moorhouse Road would see solar panels through the roadside trees in winter as they pass the Development,	Yes	Design changes to DB031 and DB032 will reduce effects in this area. However residential visual amenity and landscape and visual impacts are separate matters subject to consideration under different guidance and methodologies. Residents on Hagg Lane do not have a direct outlook onto the solar arrays to the east of their homes, and would only have distant views of those to the south (as shown by viewpoint 53). The effects on these homes would not be as great as those quoted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		along with a brief open view of the Development through a site entrance, where solar panels would block the presently open view to the east. Further south towards Moorhouse, there would be visibility of solar panels on facing slopes south of Moorhouse, backed by woodland. Changes to views from this route would mostly be Medium/small scale apart from at the site entrance where changes to views would be large scale. There would be no visibility of the Development from Green Lane heading west from Moorhouse." Statements in this section basically support our concerns that significant effects would continue to arise as a result of the changes for a range of visual receptors including the Hagg Lane properties and would "only "Slightly" reduce as a result of the maturation of mitigation planting."		
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	As previously stated, we are very disappointed there are no viewpoints and visualisations at this stage covering the Moorhouse valley viewed south, from the north. We would welcome additional representative views especially the generated visualisations of DB031 and DB032 displayed from Hagg Lane/Moorhouse Road in the interim, but would request views of this	Yes	A viewpoint has been added on Hagg Lane. Given the design changes to DB031 and DB032, it is not considered that a visualisation is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		area are specifically included for the EIA stage. We note the proposed EIA stage conforms to a 2km range which fits within our own observations of our area.		necessary in this location.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Landscape and visual	Volume 3, Figure 07.2 Topology and landcover, We note where the solar arrays have been superimposed onto this map the solar arrays have been superimposed with a solid, rather than transparent background making determination of the elevation below the panels difficult. Can the developer to resubmit the document with the solar arrays in a transparent format	Yes	A see-through hatch will be used in the updated Figure 7.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.7.2]**
Canal & River Trust	Landscape and visual	The Trust previously commented that the above-ground installation of the solar farm would result in both long term landscape/visual impacts and temporary visual impacts to facilitate construction. Due to the scope and scale of the solar project, it is likely that elements of the project will be visible from the waterway corridor managed by the Trust. Boaters using the River Trent will be within 5km of the Order Limits to the east of the solar farm. The Trust continues to advise that a proportion of the solar arrays might still	No	Boaters are one of the visual receptors considered in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. and have been considered in developing the design. The purpose

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		be visible from the banks of this section of the River Trent at certain times of the year and the indicated mitigation in the form of green buffers and hedgerow mitigation should be designed, installed and maintained appropriately to overcome this adverse effect.		of mitigation planting is not to entirely screen all visibility.
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Landscape and visual	From a parishioner viewpoint the significant adverse visual amenity impact is probably of greatest immediate concern; lets face it… these solar panels are not pretty or easy on the eye! Especially in the great volume that you are proposing, and hiding them will not be easy. Especially affected in our parish are the properties on the Kneesall Road and fronting the A616.	No	The visual receptors identified have been considered where relevant in the design of the Proposed Development. Visual effects are considered in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** and in the RVAA (Appendix 7.6 to the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]**)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Maplebeck Parish Council	Landscape and visual	It was generally accepted that the development around Maplebeck was well screened and sympathetically sited except for where it borders the Eakring to Caunton Road. Residents requested more tree planting in these areas to help screening the development.	No	Tree planting will be included along the northern boundaries of fields within the development which will be of benefit in screening views of solar areas to the south of the Eakring to Caunton Road.
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The real and perceived impact of the health and safety of BESS sites and the loss of rural landscape cannot be underestimated.	No	Effects on landscape fabric and character are fully considered in the ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**). The safety of the proposed BESS is fully considered in the ES chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				section 16.5.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**
Eakring Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The proposal will have a significant negative impact on the rural, open landscape around Eakring being highly obtrusive and creating an industrial feel to the village and its environs. The panels do not respect the area's topography and will have a negative impact on the landscape character. The panels will be visible from properties within the village e.g. those on the Eakring - Wellow Road including Eakring Windmill, Grade II listed, and Bleak House, Kirklington Road. All Fields – DB015, DB016, DB017 and DB018 will be highly visible from the A616 to the north exacerbated by the fact that Fields DB015 and DB016 are north facing and on a slope.	No	Some homes on the Eakring-Wellow Road will have views of the Proposed Development at distances of more than 0.5km. This is beyond the RVAA study area and these effects on private amenity are not considered in detail in the ES. The panel areas near Eakring are almost 2km from the A616 and any distinct views which are available would not give rise to greater than negligible effects.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Eakring Parish Council	Landscape and visual	In addition, our rural environment will be damaged further by perimeter fencing, CCTV and other associated infrastructure.	No	These components of the development will be designed as far as feasible to mitigate effects, and the effects arising from them are taken account of int he LVIA (Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**).
Eakring Parish Council	Landscape and visual	Traditional views visible from our extensive network of PROWs including the Robin Hood Way (Long Distance Footpath) that are valued by parishioners and visitors alike will be lost as will the character of the footpaths.	No	Visual effects on users of rights of way are considered in Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**.
Eakring Parish Council	Landscape and visual	The roads through Eakring particularly the proposed access route is regularly used for charity bike rides as it is part of a designated quiet cycle route. The PROW provide uninterrupted views across open countryside which will be lost by the proposed panels and infrastructure. Fencing, CCTV, panels and other	No	The nature of current views and changes to the views arising from the proposed Development are considered in Chapter 7,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		industrial infrastructure associated with the solar farm will detract from the enjoyment of using the PROW and will negatively impact the wellbeing of our community.		Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. The effects on recreational routes are assessed in Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**
Eakring Parish Council	Landscape and visual	In addition, we would like to see a wide irregular area of tree and scrub planting along the boundary adjacent to Church Hill and Eakring, Fields DB016 and DB 015 to act as screening for the village.	No	As set out within Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**, visibility from the village would be limited and this suggested mitigation measure is unnecessary.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Landscape and visual	Mitigation proposals for aesthetics and views. The proposals for planting screens to hide the solar panels from view are inadequate in the sense that more mature and established plants are needed than those proposed.	No	For the most part, landscape and visual mitigation relies on increasing the height of existing hedges by relaxing the present cutting regime. New

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				plantings will take longer to establish but will achieve meaningful mitigation within 5-10 years, which is still effective in the context of the far longer lifetime of the Proposed Development.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Section 7.1.2 sets out clearly the description of the proposals with reference to Figure 1.1 and is described as. • discrete land parcels proposed to be occupied by solar PV panels, connected by cable route areas, arranged broadly in a loop. A more detailed description follows in paragraphs 10 & 11.The landscape and visual sections of the PEIR follow a recognised best practice principal and the GLVIA3 as set out below	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	The stages from 7.7 onwards have not been reviewed at this stage as the designs have not yet been finalised and therefore the assessment is not the final version. This would be subject to further review when the design is 'fixed.' In discussions with the Applicant, they have confirmed that they have assumed a 'worst case	No	On this basis it is assumed that NSDC have no design input that they that they wish to make in relation to the mitigation of potential

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		scenario' for the development proposals. By this they mean that they have taken the greatest possible extent of the proposals in each location as the baseline position.		effects on landscape and visual receptors or residential visual amenity.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	The study has been defined at 5km however Carlton on Trent Parish Council requested a larger study area of 10km. Following a review of Figure 7.1 Solar Areas and ZTV, Figure 7.2 Topography and Landcover 7.2 Figure 7.3 Landscape Character, Figure 7.4 Landscape Character and Combined ZTV, Figure 7.5 - Visual Receptors Overview, it is agreed that 10km would not be necessary in order to assess the proposals due to their scale and size and would result in too extensive a study area. 5km is an appropriate study area and Viewpoint 17 is recorded from Carlton.	No	Section 7.13 of the PEIR proposed a 2km study area for the final assessment which was not read by NSDC based on their comment that they had not read beyond section 7.6. Subsequent meetings and correspondence resulted in the agreement of a 2km study area.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	At the time of the site assessments and field studies, where discrepancies between public routes on the ground and routes as defined on mapping data were discovered, assessments were made on the basis of the route on the ground. It is our understanding that the	Yes	Where PRoW are within the Site, their precise routing will be resolved. Where they are outside the Site, the assessment

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		definitive map should always form the baseline position, however we appreciate that there are a number of determining factors when carrying out site assessments. We recommend that at the next stage this is interrogated in more detail.		will note if the differences between routes on the ground or on the definitive map would alter the effects arising, but will not attempt to resolve the location of that route.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	The information presented across the remaining figures is appropriate and effectual with the exception of '7.5 Visual Receptors – Overview' which would benefit from a breakdown sheet by sheet to understand the visual receptors relative to the those surrounding, their location and to be able to locate them more accurately. Context and Designations are mapped in part on some of the supporting figures but would be more clearly shown on a dedicated figure.	No	Section 7.7 of the ES includes detailed inset plans for each visual receptor group, which serve this purpose. **[EN/010162/APP/6.3.7.7**
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Overall, the viewpoints are considered to be appropriate and representative of the potentially sensitive visual receptors. We agree with the cardinal approach to recording the views at this stage of the PEIR, however when photomontages are prepared, they should focus on the worst-case scenario. There is	No	The methodology for visualisations was provided in Appendix 7.2 to the PEIR. The method of visualisation proposed for each viewpoint was

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		no appended methodology for the Visualisations. This along with the selected views for advanced AVRs should be agreed with NSDC.		set out at section 7.13 of the PEIR and was agreed via subsequent meetings and correspondence.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Eakring (VPA) Eakring Conservation Area Appraisal refers to the Central Grid/Centre Parcs buildings on the Kirklington Road before entering the Conservation Area, which are described as 'prominent, their scale and massing are unexpected contrasting sharply with the domestic scale of the houses and farmsteads of the village. 'Considering that the landscape around the village was formerly designated as a Mature Landscape Area (MLA) it is recommended that a view is recorded from the southwest of the village, on the PRoW at the edge of Mill Hill looking east to understand the potential impact of the solar park when considered against the National Grid operation.	No	Mill Hill was included as an illustrative view by agreement.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Kneesall (VPB) Viewpoints 08 and 09 are recorded south of Kneesall, representing views south, east, and west across the landscape from a PRoW and the road between Eakring and Kneesall. Viewpoint 08 is recorded on the PRoW south of the village and views	Yes	This location was added as viewpoint 50 by agreement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		'across undulating fields, divided by hedges, hedgerow trees and woodlands in all directions, with more long-distance views to the southwest and west'. This is the highest point on this route; however, the view is restricted by vegetation and topography. PRoW Viewpoint 09 is selected from the road and although is representative of this location, the view is largely screened by roadside hedges. It is recommended that a view is recorded from the point on the PRoW just north of Park Farm where views are open, extensive and capture the overriding qualities of the landscape character in this location.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Caunton and Beesthorpe (VPC) Beesthorpe Hall is a Grade II listed building set in the rolling countryside to the west of Caunton, a lodge house located at the function of the driveway and the A616. The driveway is part of a PRoW connecting from Caunton, through the grounds of the Hall to Kneesall. The route follows the watercourse with views across the rising land to the south and Maplebeck. There is no view recorded along this section of the A616 which appears as a notable absence on Figure 7.5. We recommend a view is recorded along the driveway to represent users of the	Yes	This location was added as viewpoint 51 by agreement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		PRoW in this location with cultural associations (Beesthorpe Hall) and the distinctive landscape.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Viewpoint 28 (VPD) The view is record on the Prow/Bridleway however it is largely restricted by the hedgerows which bound the route. The intent of this view is to capture the potential impact of the development on the rising ground to the north. A more open view is available from the road between Upton and the A617, at the junction with the PRoW.	No	Viewpoint 28 was moved to the proposed location by agreement.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	North of Weston (VPE) There is no representative view recorded north of Weston on the higher ground. View G is an illustrative view suggested by a member of the public. Viewpoint 14 is a view recorded from the southwestern edge of the village but is restricted, being closed down by roads, hedgerow boundaries and topography. Although this is a valid representative view in terms of the general experience form the edge of the settlement, a view from the higher ground overlooking the settlement, and the landscape beyond from the PRoW near Mount Pleasant Farm, representing outlying farmsteads and the edge of Normanton on Trent is recommended as it offers a view of Weston in the context of the A1 and the proposals. Illustrative	No	This location was added as viewpoint 52 by agreement.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Viewpoint G is recorded in this approximate location, on the road and offers a panoramic, long-distance view.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Viewpoint 15 – the A1(VPF&G) There are opportunities for more open, panoramic views from laybys, overhead bridges which are ProWs rather than the location of VP 15. There is a layby south of Weston adjacent to the solar development and the bridge over the road.	Yes	Viewpoint 15 was moved to a new location by agreement.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	The Illustrative Views9 are quoted as being chosen 'specifically to demonstrate a particular effect or specific issues' however they appear to be views which were not scoped in at the early EIA stages but have been added as a response to public concern. As above we recommend that a location near Illustrative Viewpoint G should be a Representative Viewpoint.	Yes	Illustrative views are referred to in the assessment, however the appendix has been updated to make their purpose (rather than their derivation) clearer when reading the appendix alone.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	The methodology is set out in TA A7.2-LVIA Methodology and is clear, concise and follows recommended guidance and best practice. We would expect to see a detailed methodology for the AVR/Photomontages as part of the next stages of the project. Considering Cumulative Impact, there are a	No	The visualisation methodology was subsequently discussed and agreed.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		number of solar array applications in the planning process currently which should be monitored. The developments to be included should be agreed with NSDC. Cardinal views have been recorded at this stage which is appropriate however when the verifiable views are presented the applicant should ensure they encompass all the development appropriately. The views to be montaged should be agreed with NSDC		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	NSDC agree with the principles of the methodology outlined in TA A7.2 - LVIA Methodology. However, a more detailed methodology which clearly sets out the viewpoints where photomontages will be provided would be expected as part of the next stages of the project. We have reviewed the viewpoints presented in Figure 7.1 Solar Areas ZTV Study – Including Screening and Figure7.11 Visualisations – Viewpoints 1-49. From a conservation perspective, NSDC agree that the proposed Viewpoints 1-49 are appropriate overall.	No	Viewpoints proposed to be photomontaged were set out in section 7.13 of the PEIR. Once new viewpoints had been added, this list was amended and agreed with NSDC.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	NSDC consider that the PEIR Masterplan Overview is presented in a manner that is clear and assists in the understanding of the scheme proposals. As NSDC have suggested in previous informal discussions, given the scale, and spread of the proposed development, further consideration should be given to how the visual extent of the scheme can be represented within the landscape. Whilst photomontages within the LVIA work will assist, a CG model or similar providing an overview/run through of the entire scheme will assist in the understanding and interpretation of the proposed development and understanding of how the development 'sits' within the wider context.	No	Computer models and fly throughs are not materials that can be submitted as part of an application, though were used during public consultation.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Figure 5.2 – Sheet 1 – It would appear that Solar Array area DB002 is close to being within 100m of the nearest residential properties to the south (fronting Broadgate Lane). NSDC note that within the Design Approach Document, areas within 100m of residential buildings are 'not preferred.' NSDC considers that such proximity should also apply to the private amenity areas of residential properties also (not simply the houses). The Applicant should consider whether this is	No	Changes to the design for other environmental reasons have removed solar panels from these areas.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		an acceptable relationship from a residential visual amenity perspective.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Figure 5.2 – Sheet 2 – It would appear that there is an existing residential property to the northeast of Solar Array DB010 which is within 100m. Whilst it is noted there is some existing mature tree planting in this part of the existing land, the access road serving the property is directly adjacent to the land.	No	Changes to the design for other environmental reasons have removed solar panels from these areas. The distance to the Proposed Development from residential properties and the potential effects on these homes are detailed in Technical Appendix 7.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]** . Distances of less than 100m may be used where views are screened or mostly screened, or around properties of involved landowners.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Figure 5.2 – Sheet 4 – NSDC note that Brecks Farm is surrounded by Solar Arrays on 3 sides, from areas DB013 and DB014 and it would appear that in two locations, the arrays are within 100m of the property.	No	Changes to the design for other environmental reasons have removed solar panels from these areas. The distance to the Proposed Development from residential properties and the potential effects on these homes are detailed in Technical Appendix 7.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]** . Distances of less than 100m may be used where views are screened or mostly screened, or around properties of involved landowners.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Figure 5.2 – Sheet 6 – NSDC note that Solar Array area DB032 is in close proximity to Ladywood Farm to the west and south and would appear well within 100m to the west. NSDC would recommend that this relationship is considered further.	No	Changes to the design for other environmental reasons have removed solar panels from these areas. The distance to the Proposed Development from residential properties and the potential effects on these homes are detailed in Technical Appendix 7.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]** . Distances of less than 100m may be used where views are screened or mostly screened, or around properties of involved landowners.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Figure 5.2 – Sheet 8 – NSDC note that Solar Array area DB045 is within around 100m of Hill Farm and Foxholes Farm appears to be within 100m of DB056	No	Changes to the design for other environmental reasons have removed solar panels from these areas. The distance to the Proposed Development from residential properties and the potential effects on these homes are detailed in Technical Appendix 7.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.7.6]** . Distances of less than 100m may be used where views are screened or mostly screened, or around properties of involved landowners.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Landscape and visual	Figure 5.2 – Sheet 9 – DB003 to the east of Brickyard Cottages appears to be within 100m.	No	Changes to the design for other environmental reasons have removed solar panels from these areas.
Natural England	Landscape and visual	We welcome the reference made to Natural England's Character Areas (NCS) in the Landscape and Visual Chapter, as well as in the Technical Appendix A7.5, which acknowledge the aim of NCAs in assisting with localised decision making. We advise that the development should avoid impact to and, where possible, enhance local distinctiveness.	No	Noted.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council (Appended to NSDC Response)	Landscape and visual	The site covers 7000 acres. A site of this scale cannot be hidden behind a few hedges. The rolling nature of the countryside in this area means there are vistas across the proposed site where it will be possible to see vast expanses of solar panels. This development will turn a green and rural landscape into a black and grey industrial one. The district already has over 1300 acres of farmland committed to solar arrays. GNR Solar Farm at 7000 acres and One Earth Solar Farm at 3500 will result in	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Visual impacts are an inevitable consequence of solar development at this scale. National planning policy recognises this but also indicates that reductions on the scale of a nationally significant

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		over 10% of the district's farmland being turned over to solar energy. The district will no longer be an area of natural beauty; it will be impossible to avoid seeing solar panels when travelling in and around the area.		solar farm in order to address landscape and visual effects should only be made in exceptional circumstances, where mitigation could have a very significant benefit and warrant a small reduction in function. For more information, please refer to ES Chapter 7, Landscape and Visual **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. This chapter presents the findings of the assessment of the likely significant effect arising from the construction, operation, and decommissioning of the Development on landscape and visual receptors.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	As the hamlet lies in a shallow hollow, not only will the visual and flood impact on this rural community will be significant for all properties, the parish council has received representations that significant noise reverberation in the "hollow" would have significant mental health implications for its residents.		Noise modelling includes terrain data (i.e. ground elevations) and as such any effects of local topography are accounted for in the predictions.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	It is requested that a noise risk assessment are developed through consultation with the local community.	No	The DCO process allows for local community responses to be considered throughout the process. Where appropriate, local community responses relating to noise will be fed into the design.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	In Table 1, which focuses on the hardstanding construction, it does not include any plant for the installation of the deer fence poles. Piling is often cited as one of the more annoying and impacting repetitive sounds by receptors. As this piling will occur at the outer edges of the development, this noise pollution will often be the nearest to any external receptors.	No	Piling plant is included in Table A12.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.12.2]** as part of the installation of PV modules and fencing. Any piling associated

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				with the installation of deer fences is therefore inherently included as part of the assessment of the PV module construction.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	At paragraphs 10 to 12 which deals with noise from HGV traffic, it concludes "the predicted noise level for HGV movements is 60 dBLAeq,t at a distance of 4 m from the road." Arriving at this conclusion, the Applicant makes certain assumptions, a key one being that the nearest receptor is 4m away.	No	The use of roads by pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and their horses is transitory and as such these receptors will not be subject to long-term noise exposure that would result in health impacts.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	There is no doubt that many receptors will be 4m or more away from the road. However, there will also be receptors closer than 4m.	No	The use of roads by pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and their horses is transitory and as such these receptors will not be subject to long-term noise

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				exposure that would result in health impacts.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	These calculations do not account for other road users, be they pedestrians, cyclists or horse riders and their horses. Chapter 14 recognises that non-motorised users are sensitive receptors. Therefore, there has to be value, given the restricted widths of some of the proposed construction traffic access routes, that a similar calculation to that at paragraphs 10-11 of TA A12.2 be completed, but with a worst case scenario of 2m to the nearest receptor.	No	The use of roads by pedestrians, cyclists, horse riders and their horses is transitory and as such these receptors will not be subject to long-term noise exposure that would result in health impacts.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	The word 'vibration' does not appear in Chapter 14 or TA A14.1 Vibration is addressed in A12.2 but this is only for on-site construction.	No	The assessment of vibration is undertaken in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]** . A consideration of Construction Traffic Vibration is presented in Section 4 of Chapter 12.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	It is possible that such route examination detail may well be included in the CTMP. However, if one is examining a vibration issue, then it would make sense for that to be in the Noise and Vibration report.	No	The assessment of vibration is undertaken in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]** A consideration of Construction Traffic Vibration is presented in Section 4 of Chapter 12.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	Just as with the noise assessment, the deer pole installations are not assessed for vibration.	No	Piling plant is included in Table A12.2.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.12.2]** as part of the installation of PV modules and fencing. Any piling associated with the installation of deer fences is therefore inherently included as part of the assessment of the PV module construction.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	Though it is unlikely that their pile driving vibration will have any effect on residences or other buildings, certain wildlife are very vulnerable to vibration. One example would be bees.	No	The CEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** states that an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) will be appointed. The scope of works for the ECoW includes planning for known ecological issues and localised constraints, and responding to new ones. Therefore, where new sensitivities are identified (i.e. beehives) appropriate mitigation can be identified an implemented, where necessary.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	In 2024, deer post were installed in Norwell too close to several hives. The vibration led to the loss of most of the hives: bees communicate by vibration. There does not appear to be any assessment yet of the ground	No	The CEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** states that an Ecological Clerk of Works (ECoW) will be appointed. The

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		vibration impacts for large scale deer fence post installation.		scope of works for the ECoW includes planning for known ecological issues and localised constraints, and responding to new ones. Therefore, where new sensitivities are identified (i.e. beehives) appropriate mitigation can be identified an implemented, where necessary.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Noise and vibration	Additional need for further assessment of the vibration effects on heritage assets (as suggested by PINs) as HGVs will be passing within 4m of numerous designated heritage assets	No	The CTMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** states that a pre-commencement survey will be undertaken to identify defects in the road surface that require remedial measures prior to works commencing. Where required,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				remedial measures to defects such as potholes will be implemented, with particular focus on those located close to heritage assets and residential properties to minimise the impact from noise and vibration.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Noise and vibration	Will have a detrimental impact on traffic noise that is already an issue from the A1(M) particularly during the winter months when there is less vegetation on the trees that provides a partial natural barrier during the summer months.	No	Assessment of construction traffic is presented in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Noise and vibration	The noise during the construction phase will compound the traffic noise to the extent that some sensitive receptors within the village will be affected (dwellings, Village Hall, leisure areas and church)	No	Assessment of construction traffic is presented in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	The residents have great concerns relating to possible construction and traffic related noise and vibration within this portion of the development. Particularly relating to houses which border Moorhouse Road.	No	Assessment of construction traffic is presented in ES Chapter

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	The properties at Hagg Lane sit in an elevated location above the site. It is not uncommon to hear clearly the sound of livestock and agricultural activity for instance ploughing and combining from within approximately a 2km radius. In summer early evenings it is possible to hear the road surface noise of the A1 as well as the sound of trains on the East Coast Mainline. We therefore consider that with our elevated position can be receptors to all manner of noise.	No	Noise modelling includes terrain data and as such any effects of local topography are accounted for in the predictions.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	Gypsy Lodge sits within two metres of Moorhouse Road, with its external walls - the only barrier to the noise and vibration of the road traffic outside as well as being in a reasonably elevated position within the scheme. Please see appendix 3. We therefore have concerns relating to the construction of the scheme, both from the equipment that is utilised as well as the high increase in road traffic (potentially around 41 HGV's a day vs 4 HGV's presently) as per your own reports in other chapters.	No	Vibration effects are assessed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. The CTMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** states that a pre-commencement survey will be undertaken to identify defects in the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				road surface that require remedial measures prior to works commencing. Where required, remedial measures to defects such as potholes will be implemented, with particular focus on those located close to residential properties to minimise the impact vibration. In addition, vibration effects from road traffic will be substantially reduced where there is no solid (e.g., concrete) connection between the road carriageway and the wall/foundation of the building. It is understood, from discussion with the owner of this property at

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				consultation events, that there is no such connection at Gypsy Lodge.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	Can you please explain the rationale between which receptors are tied to particular monitoring stations. We can see the details for ML1 and ML2 show very different responses in terms of measured dB ranges and we are keen to understand the rationale behind the choice of monitoring locations applied to Hagg Lane / Gypsy Lodge as the chosen locations are very different in their placement and environment, and neither seems appropriate to the high Hagg Lane position within the scheme.	No	Table A12.1 is Appendix A12.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.12.1]** Survey presents the locations of the assessment locations and representative monitoring locations. During the survey it was noted that in this area the A1 was the dominant noise source. Monitoring locations in this area were therefore selected to be a similar distance from the A1 as the associated representative assessment locations. In

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				particular, Monitoring Location 2 is further from the A1 than receptors on Hagg Lane, and as such in practice background levels at Hagg Lane will likely be higher than those assessed as part of the assessment. It is also notable that all assessment locations and representative monitoring locations were agreed with the Environmental Health Department at NSDC.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	what technical mitigation can be offered to offset the increased volume and frequency of the road noise at Gypsy Lodge? We would consider that an increase greater than or equal to 5.0dB, relating to a "major" impact would be achieved regularly.	No	The CTMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** states that a pre-commencement survey will be undertaken to identify defects in the road surface that require

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				remedial measures prior to works commencing. Where required, remedial measures to defects such as potholes will be implemented, with particular focus on those located close to residential properties to minimise the impact of noise and vibration. Section 12.7 in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12** shows that major impacts due to construction traffic noise are avoided.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	We note Hagg Lane / Gypsy Lodge have been discounted as noise receptors on Figures 12.3/4/5 as we sit outside the 300m imposed boundary. However, we note properties in Weston which are actually further away from the proposed arrays and their infrastructure, are still included as receptors, purely due to their proximity to the proposed access tracks on Ladywood Lane and Wadnal Lane, which form the order constraints – These not construction zones. Can you please confirm the rationale for displaying noise receptors well outside the construction zones? We would request that at least Rundell House, Hagg Lane still be shown for consideration as a Noise Receptor within the scheme on these maps for future reference	No	The construction noise study area of 300m is specified in the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), as discussed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12**. Inclusion of all receptors within 300 m of the Order Limits (not construction areas) is therefore worst case, as in many areas of construction works will not take place at the Order Limit boundary.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	We note the noise maps, particularly for the erection of the solar arrays, where we expect piling noise to be prominent, shows simply a zone of 65dB surrounding the arrays. However, it is disappointing that an overall table is not available showing the prospective noise levels for individual receptors	No	The assessment methodology was discussed and agreed with the environmental health department at NSDC. Identification of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				receptors exceeding the 65 dB LAeq, threshold is an appropriate and proportionate approach where the number of potential receptors is large, and as such it is not considered necessary to predict individual construction noise levels at all receptors.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	We note from the construction of Egmanton Solar Farm that piling noise could be heard clearly at Gypsy Lodge. We would welcome more precise information of the anticipated maximum construction noise at both Hagg Lane properties and Gypsy Lodge. We understand within your construction mitigation measures; items of plant can utilise sound deadening methodology such as acoustic screens. Can you confirm if mobile piling processed would utilise a mobile acoustic screen	No	Figure 12.3 **[EN010162/APP/6.3.12.3]** shows that noise levels during piling activities will be below the 65 dB LAeq threshold at properties along Hagg Lane. As stated in the CEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** , a detailed Construction

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Noise Management Plan (CNMP) will be developed by the Contractor, based on the finalised location of construction activities and equipment to be used on site. The CNMP will identify any mitigation measures required to ensure the noise and vibration thresholds are not exceeded.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	We note from the Noise and Vibration documentation and through our own research that the properties on Hagg Lane and Gypsy Lodge sit several hundred meters outside the zone which may reasonably be expected to experience construction related vibration. However, we would refer back to the proximity of Gypsy Lodge to the road and the impact of vibration from a dramatic increase of vehicular transport on Moorhouse Road.	No	Vibration effects are assessed in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12**. The CTMP states that a pre-commencement survey will be undertaken to identify defects in the road

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				surface that require remedial measures prior to works commencing. Where required, remedial measures to defects such as potholes will be implemented, with particular focus on those located close to residential properties to minimise the impact vibration.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Noise and Vibration	the developer will be responsible for upkeep of the road surface to a suitable standard to prevent excessive vibration (or road noise) from developing. Can you please confirm the responsibilities for the upkeep of roads	No	The Highways Agency will be responsible for the upkeep of roads, as normal. The Developer will be required to repair damage caused by construction and to ensure that the road is left in no worse condition than it was before construction.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Noise and Vibration	The increased noise during the construction phase will affect all the parishes and although it is inevitable and hopefully short lived… if we could have an assurance from Elements Green that it would only take place between certain hours it might dissipate the negative effects.	No	Construction working hours for 'noisy' activity are 0730 - 1800 Monday - Friday, and 0700 to 1300 on a Saturday.
Maplebeck Parish Council	Noise and Vibration	Working hours should be restricted to normal working week as partisan concerns were raised about noise levels from pile driving operations.	No	Construction working hours for 'noisy' activity are 0730 - 1800 Monday - Friday, and 0700 to 1300 on a Saturday.
Eakring Parish Council	Noise and Vibration	The construction phase will result in an increase in noise and vibration pollution associated with the movement of vehicles, heavy machinery etc. which is unacceptable for both residents and wildlife. Eakring supports a number of successful businesses	No	The assessment of noise and vibration is undertaken in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12** and concludes that the impact of noise and vibration is predicted to be Negligible to Minor Adverse and are therefore not significant

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Noise and Vibration	There will be an unacceptable, increased level of traffic noise experienced by sensitive receptors in our village (there is a play area adjacent to the 86325, shops and businesses along the route, and residential properties in close proximity to both the 86325 and A616).	No	The assessment of noise and vibration is undertaken in ES Chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12** and concludes that the impact of noise and vibration is predicted to be Negligible to Minor Adverse and are therefore not significant
Environment Agency	Noise and Vibration	In regards to requirement 15 Operational noise, we wish for the wording to be amended to the following:• 23.—(1) No [stage of the] authorised development shall commence until, after consultation with the relevant planning authority and Environment Agency, a written scheme for noise management during construction and maintenance [of that stage] has been submitted to and approved by the Commission. o (2) The scheme shall set out the particulars of—▪ (a)the works, and the method by which they are to be carried out; 28 ▪ (b)the noise attenuation measures to be taken	No	The operational noise requirements in the draft DCO are considered effective and are consistent with those found in similar DCOs for solar projects that have recently been made.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		to minimise noise resulting from the works, including any noise limits, equipment selection and operation, timing, screening and other good practice; and▪ (c)a scheme for monitoring the noise during the works to ensure compliance with the noise limits and the effectiveness of the attenuation measures. o (3) The approved noise management scheme must be implemented before and maintained during construction and maintenance of the [relevant stage of the] authorised development. o (4) The construction and maintenance works must be undertaken in accordance with the approved noise management scheme.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Noise and Vibration	In respect of working hours, under the heading of Construction Noise Assessment Methodology Paragraph 12.4.3 states that working hours of between 0700 and 1900, Monday to Friday, and 0700 to 1300 on a Saturday. In order to protect sensitive residential receptors in the area, NSDC would request that hours of construction for 'noisy' activity instead be limited to the hours of 07:30- 18:00 Monday to Friday and 08:00-13:00 on Saturdays.	Yes	Construction working hours for 'noisy' activity have been updated to 0730 - 1800 Monday - Friday, and 0700 to 1300 on a Saturday.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Noise and Vibration	Under the heading of Operational Noise, paragraph 12.6.2 confirms that modelling of noise from plant and equipment as detain the illustrative layout has been undertaken. Taking into account, that the design may evolve in this regard should the layout and plant details be changed, the assessment will need to be reviewed and updated as needed to ensure it remains representative.	No	This is controlled by Requirement 15 of the DCO
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Noise and Vibration	As part of the noise assessment undertaken noise levels at representative receptors have been assessed in accordance with BS4142. This is considered to be an appropriate standard for assessing noise from the development. Assumptions in relation to operation of the site have been made such that the assessment will be conservative in terms of generated noise levels.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Noise and Vibration	As detailed under the heading of Operational Noise Effects, paragraph 12.7.4 notes that at the majority of receptors, the rating level of noise from the development is below background noise levels, representing a negligible impact. A low impact has been predicted at other receptors, where the rating level is above background levels. However, in these locations, background levels are particularly low, and	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		absolute noise levels at the building façade will be sufficiently low to prevent disturbance.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Noise and Vibration	Finally, Paragraph 12.6 sets out the development design mitigation and it is also noted that Requirement 15 within the DCO seeks to secure an operational noise assessment detailing how the design will incorporate this mitigation, which is supported.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Noise and Vibration	Under the heading of Construction and Decommissioning Noise Effects Paragraph 12.7.1 refers to the potential noise effects, in constructing the different elements of the scheme. This assessment includes for a variety of phases of work of distances at which noise levels will fall below a medium magnitude impact. These distances have then been compared to the site plan to determine if any sensitive receptors fall within this distance. It has been identified that specific properties will lie within these areas for a number of activities, but that the likely duration of impact will be minimal as work progresses. As such, no significant impact at any receptor is predicted at the current stage of assessment. Linked into this point Paragraph 12.6.1 states that a detailed Construction Noise Management Plan (CNMP) will be developed by the Applicant r,	No	The Construction Noise Management Plan (CNMP) will be submitted as part of the CEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** **,** which would be secured through Requirement 12.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		based on finalised location of construction activities and equipment to be used on site. Whilst it is noted that the CNMP will be submitted to approval to relevant stakeholders, the 'approving' bodies are not defined, and neither is the process. It is unclear whether the CNMP would form part of the approved Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) which itself is currently listed as draft Requirement 12. The Applicant should explain how the measures in the CNMP will be secured, including a role for NSDC to consider and approve this.		
Natural England	Noise and Vibration	Section 8.8.4.1 para 164 identifies that the frequency of traffic movements will increase during construction, however noise arising from this will not be significant. NE concur with this assessment.	No	Noted.
North Muskham Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	For Newark & Sherwood district (N&S), encompassing 65,134 hectares (Ha), the Great North Road Solar project of 2,900Ha would, on its own, amount to 4.5% of all land, 4.82% of all non-developed land and 6.08% of Agricultural land in N&S.	No	The Development now encompasses an Order Limit area of 1,765ha at final design. ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** deals with Agricultural

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Land take percentages relative to geographies
North Muskham Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The GNR Solar Park would double the amount of land already occupied by Transport and Utilities in N&S from 4.02% (2,618Ha) to 8.47% (5,518Ha). It would occupy more land in N&S than all the residential dwellings, and their residential gardens combined which cover 4.18 (2,720Ha). It would increase the amount of land in development use in N&S from 7.39% (4,815Ha) to 11.84% (7,715Ha).	No	ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** deals with Agricultural Land take relative to geographies
North Muskham Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The GNR Solar Park is unusual (and possibly unique) given its circular nature. This means that the 2,900Ha site effectively extends across an area of 18,119Ha or 27.8% of the whole of N&S. Certainly all people within this area will be adversely affected, as well those outside the circle for many miles.	Yes	The Order Limits now occupy 1,765ha of land which is no longer in a circular shape.
North Muskham Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The figures are even more startling when looked at by the Middle Super Output Area (MSOA) that most closely corresponds to the geographical extent of the GNR Solar project ie Newark and Sherwood 003 (Muskham, Sutton on Trent and Walesby). The GNR Solar Park on its own would amount to 18.26% of all land, 19% of all nondeveloped land and a staggering	No	ES Chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]** deals with Agricultural Land take relative to geographies

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		21.58% of agricultural land in the MSOA. It would occupy over nine times that of all residential dwellings and their residential gardens combined which cover just 2.27% (360Ha) on the MSOA. It would increase the amount of land in developed use from 4.86% (772Ha) to 23.12% (3,3672Ha).		
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The parish council supports the removal of certain fields from the proposal being unsuitable for development.	No	Specification for the establishment and maintenance of screening hedges is be included in the LEMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]** and the parish supporting field removal is noted.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	Field 154 should be removed because it this field is north sloped and will be significantly compromised in its solar collection capability.	No	The north facing slope of field 154 has been removed from the design.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The East Midlands is not a good area for solar farm placement. Placing the same array in other areas would experience greater irradiated solar energy for more sunshine hours per year. As an alternative to farmland, there is extensive commercial south facing roofing which could be employed for solar capture and their distributed nature would lessen the need for significant distribution infrastructure upgrades.	No	The Development is viable in its proposed location, as set out in the ES Technical Appendix A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/5.6]**, Design Approach Document. The applicant believes that solar PV should also be located on residential and commercial roofs, where suitable, but that an 800 MW solar development could not viably be distributed across roofs.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The whole of the area surrounding Moorhouse and Laxton are ancient and continued use farmland. In medieval times the whole of Laxton and Moorhouse Parish was strip farmed with maps from the 1600's detailing land use held in Laxton Church and in the Bodleian Library. Laxton still operates a strip farming system under the Court Leet which is protected by a	No	The area used by Laxton's strip farming system will not be affected by the Development and is outside the Order Limits.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		parliamentary undertaking given by the Thoresby Estate.		
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The identified fields listed above form part of the historically sensitive East Nottinghamshire landscape and should be spared from development which would change its historic and agriculturally important nature.	No	The area used by Laxton's strip farming system will not be affected by the Development and is outside the Order Limits.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	Much of the attention and mitigation to date has not addressed the particular locality of Moorhouse which will effectively be surrounded with construction proposed too close to dwellings and the community.	No	The assessment of effects of construction and operation of the Development has considered the whole Development, including Moorhouse. The assessments are presented in the ES.
Laxton and Moorhouse	Site selection and	The parish council requests that the impact on the hamlet of Moorhouse is specifically considered and addressed.	No	The assessment of effects of construction and operation of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council	alternatives			Development has considered the whole Development, including Moorhouse. The assessments and design evolution in relation to the Moorhouse area are presented in the ES.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The Council have serious concerns regarding the design and location of the BESS.	No	The BESS has been appropriately sited as detailed in the Design Approach Document **[EN010162/APP/5.6]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	If the areas in Flood zones 2 and 3 were removed as planned panel fields, the project could still progress but in a different design. That might involve more cabling, but that design precedent has already been set in these plans.	Yes	Indeed, the Applicant has removed the solar panel development from the areas containing flood zones 2 and 3.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	There is no statutory, regulatory or functionality requirement that means all NSIP solar farms should be 800MW. A redesign would merely affect a contribution towards net zero (in a very minor way) but probably more importantly for some, profit.	No	It is correct to state that solar NSIPs need not necessarily deliver 800MW of power. However, 400kV

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				infrastructure must still be built to accommodate a smaller NSIP, such as a 300MW or 400MW scheme. It is therefore a very efficient use of the required substation build to maximise both the grid connection infrastructure at the National Grid side as well as the customer side with relatively smaller environmental effects as the site is scaled up. This contributes more to the desired reduction in wholesale power prices as the overall MW cost of delivery of the Development reduces with scale.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GTC	Site selection and alternatives	There is one gas network outside of the order limits however it is nearby, located in Kelham that could potentially be affected, I attach the GTC asset map of the location for you to see where the gas network is located in regards to the order limits of the solar farm.		There will be no works outside of the Order Limits, and therefore the gas network in Kelham will not be affected.
Health and Safety Executive	Site selection and alternatives	According to HSE's records, the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project is not within the consultation zones of any major accident hazard sites or major accident hazard pipelines.	No	Noted.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Site selection and alternatives	several Egmanton properties fall within 500m of the development, which will create possible visual, noise, vibration and traffic related issues. The affected properties are listed below: Hagg Lane - NG22 0HJ – Collectively labelled as Egmanton Common Farm on maps • The Old Granary – Domestic property • The Linhay – Domestic property • Woodland View – Domestic property • Egmanton Common Farm – Domestic Property • Rundell House – Domestic Property Furthermore, there are the following farming and commercial properties:	No	Visual effects are assessed in ES chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. Noise and vibration effects are assessed in ES chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. Traffic effects are assessed in ES chapter 14, Traffic and Transport

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		• Barn and hardstanding operated by JS Dakin Farms • Industrial Unit owned by JS Dakin Farms, leased to local businesses		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. Interrelationship effects are assessed in ES chapter 19, Interrelationships **[EN010162/APP/6.2.19]**.
Severn Trent Water	Site selection and alternatives	Please be advised there are Severn Trent Water assets within the proposed development site. Severn Trent Water records can be accessed via digdat.co.uk. Please keep any proposed building 5m clear of pressurised sewers, and 15m from any pumping station. We do not allow building over of public sewers or water mains.	No	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Severn Trent Water with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Severn Trent Water.
Severn Trent Water	Site selection and alternatives	Our records are a guide only, therefore you should carry out site investigation to confirm position, depth and size of sewers. For sewers up to and including 225mm diameter Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 6m placed centrally over the pipe. For sewers over 225mm diameter but less than 1000mm Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 10m placed centrally	No	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Severn Trent Water with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		over the pipe. For sewers greater than 1000mm Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 15m placed centrally over the pipe. For Pumping Stations Severn Trent requires 15m protective strip from the edge of the compound		protective provision schedule in the DCO for Severn Trent Water.
Severn Trent Water	Site selection and alternatives	Our records are a guide only, therefore you should carry out site investigation to confirm position, depth and size of water mains (we require RAMS for this) Please note the following protective strips where no building will be allowed. For water mains less than 300mm diameter Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 6m placed centrally over the pipe For water mains 300mm diameter and above Severn Trent requires a protective strip of 12m placed centrally over the pipe	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Severn Trent Water with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Severn Trent Water.
Canal & River Trust	Site selection and alternatives	The Trust reiterates that the proposals are not in close proximity to Trust land or waterways. Should the red line boundary of the scheme be amended the Trust would wish to be reconsulted on the proposals so that any impacts on Trust assets can be fully assessed.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	Cadent has so far identified the following apparatus within the vicinity of the proposed works: ▪ Medium pressure (below 2 bar) gas pipelines and associated above and below ground equipment (as a result it is highly likely that there are also gas services and associated apparatus in the vicinity, these are not shown on plans but their presence should be anticipated and investigated further) ▪ Above Ground Installations	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	In order to assess the impact to Cadent's apparatus and network, as a minimum we need to conduct a high level impact assessment and feasilbity study of our below 7 bar and above 7 bar network associated with the Scheme. This work can take upwards of 12 months to undertake depending on the complexity of the scheme and therefore a meeting with the Promoter to discuss the scope and requirements is recommended at the earliest opportunity.	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, will arrange the meeting and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.
Cadent	Site selection and	Where diversions of apparatus are required to facilitate the scheme, Cadent will require the Promoter to obtain all necessary land, planning permissions and other consents to enable the diversion works to be carried	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
	alternatives	out. Details of these consents should be agreed in writing with Cadent before any applications are made to ensure that they are sufficient to deliver works within the proposed timescales. Cadent would ordinarily require a minimum of Conceptual Design study to have been carried out to establish appropriate diversion routes, land and consents requirements ahead of any application being made.		design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with any of Cadent's apparatus, Cadent will require appropriate protection for retained apparatus and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights including adequate Protective Provisions. Operations within Cadent's existing easement strips are not permitted without approval and any proposals for work in the vicinity for Cadent's existing apparatus will require approval by Plant Protection under the Protective Provisions. Early discussions are advised	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	Cadent will also need to ensure that all pipelines remain accessible throughout and after completion of the works	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	The actual depth and position must be confirmed on site by trial hole investigation under the supervision of a Cadent representative. Ground cover above our pipelines should not be reduced or increased.	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	If any excavations are planned within 3 metres of Cadent High Pressure Pipeline or, within 10 metres of an AGI (Above Ground Installation), or if any embankment or dredging works are proposed then the actual position and depth of the pipeline must be	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		established on site in the presence of a Cadent representative. A safe working method agreed prior to any work taking place in order to minimise the risk of damage and ensure the final depth of cover does not affect the integrity of the pipeline.		these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	Where existing roads cannot be used, construction traffic should ONLY cross the pipeline at agreed locations. The pipeline shall be protected, at the crossing points, by temporary rafts constructed at ground level. The third party shall review ground conditions, vehicle types and crossing frequencies to determine the type and construction of the raft required. The type of raft shall be agreed with Cadent prior to installation.	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	No protective measures including the installation of concrete slab protection shall be installed over or near to the Cadent pipeline without the prior permission of Cadent. Cadent will need to agree the material, the dimensions and method of installation of the proposed protective measure. The method of installation shall be confirmed through the submission of a formal written method statement from the contractor to Cadent. A	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Cadent representative shall monitor any works within close proximity to the pipeline.		
Cadent	Site selection and alternatives	New services may cross the pipeline at perpendicular angle to the pipeline i.e. 90 degrees. Where a new service is to cross over the pipeline a clearance distance of 0.6 metres between the crown of the pipeline and underside of the service should be maintained. If this cannot be achieved the service shall cross below the pipeline with a clearance distance of 0.6 metres. A new service should not be laid parallel within an easement strip. A Cadent representative shall approve and supervise any new service crossing of a pipeline. An exposed pipeline should be suitable supported and removed prior to backfilling. An exposed pipeline should be protected by matting and suitable timber cladding. For pipe construction involving deep excavation (<1.5m) in the vicinity of grey iron mains, the model consultative procedure will apply therefore an integrity assessment must be conducted to confirm if diversion is required	Yes	These constraints have been considered, the Applicant has contacted Cadent with regard to design updates, and these will be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for Cadent.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Eakring Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	All the fields to be panelled are classified Grade 2 – Very good quality agricultural land ALC (Best and Most Versatile soils) which will be lost to commercial agriculture. In the opinion of Eakring Parish Council solar panels should be placed on rooftops and brownfield sites not high yielding agricultural land.	No	Grades of land and effects on agriculture are covered in ES chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**. The Applicant supports the Development of rooftop solar power alongside ground mounted solar in order to meet the stretching overall UK Clean Power 2030 target.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	This is a rural area, not an industrial one that is more able to cope with such a large scale industrial change.	No	The effects of the Development are assessed in the ES.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	Questions as to need, positioning of the planned solar arrays along with the reality of the actual ecological benefits to this area are not addressed well enough in the proposal and leave many questions and worries unanswered.	No	ES Chapter 4, Site Selection and Design **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** provides details of the site selection process. Solar PV has been removed from the immediate vicinity of South Muskham and Little Carlton, but the mitigation and enhancement areas have been retained. Details of the management of these areas are provided in the oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1]**).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Agricultural Land and Soils	The fields proposed as part of the development around South Muskham and Little Carlton are graded 3(a), best most versatile land, and by including in the scheme will remove it from vital food production. Areas of poorer quality land have been untouched.	No	Grades of land and effects on agriculture and covered in ES chapter 17, Agricultural Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Site selection and alternatives	The UK imports around 40% of the food we consume. In the current unsettled world we live in, we need to retain the facility to increase our home production proportion. Furthermore, the future of the aviation industry will be based on bio-fuels so surely good quality arable land would be better used for this purpose rather than turned into an industrial site. These fields are vital in providing habitat to ground nesting birds and that will be completely destroyed or severely altered.	No	The need for the Development is set out in the Planning Statement and Statement of Need, submitted with the application. The effects on ecology, and mitigation of these effects, are described in the ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
NGET	Site selection and alternatives	Existing Infrastructure , Substation: • Staythorpe 1B 132 kV Substation • Staythorpe 1C 132 kV Substation • Staythorpe 400 kV Substation • Associated overhead and underground apparatus including cables	No	This is noted and required design updates with be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for NGET.
NGET	Site selection and alternatives	Existing Infrastructure , Overhead Lines: ZDF 400 kV OHL Cottam- Staythorpe 1 High Marnham-Stoke Bardolph ZDA 400 kV OHL Cottam- Grendon Cottam- Staythorpe 2 KK 25 kV OHL Newark BR – Staythorpe B 4ZV 400 kV OHL Chesterfield- High Marnham 1 Chesterfield- High Marnham 2 ZD 400 kV OHL High Marnham – Stoke Bardolph Ratcliffe- Staythorpe	No	This is noted and required design updates with be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for NGET.
NGET	Site selection and alternatives	Existing Infrastructure , Cable Apparatus • Cable Fibre- 6789 • Cable Fibre- 4826	No	This is noted and required design updates with be secured via a protective provision schedule in the DCO for NGET.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Site selection and alternatives	In respect of the site selection process detailed at Section 3, the details provided on how areas were identified as being suitable or not suitable are useful based on the different criteria. Notwithstanding this NSDC note that available land (notwithstanding the Applicant's preference to avoid CPO of land where possible) is a key criterion aligned to securing a grid connection agreement and therefore it would be useful for the Applicant to provide more information on land that was discounted for inclusion based on unwillingness from a landowner, that may have been preferable from a reduced impact perspective. This issue links into a wider point on the Applicant's regulatory obligations on the consideration of alternatives as mentioned earlier in this correspondence. As such, further details of land discounted and/or excluded based on the criteria identified would provide a more informed understanding on the evolution of the scheme proposals. It may also assist the Applicant in explaining and justifying that the scheme presented at this stage generates the 'least' environmental impacts.	Yes	The Design Approach Document (DaD) **[EN010162/APP/5.6]** and ES Chapter 4, Alternatives **[EN010162/APP/6.2.4]** describe this process in detail and the comments are noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Site selection and alternatives	The proposed development is not located within, or within the setting of, any nationally designated landscapes, as noted in para 71, section 7.5.3 which correctly identifies that there are no nationally designated landscapes within 30 km of the Order limits.	No	Noted.
Natural England	Site selection and alternatives	NE acknowledge and welcome the embedded mitigation measures included within the proposed project design as detailed in Table 7.3. In particular we note that the site selection has avoided designated landscapes such that it is neither within or in close proximity to nationally or locally designated landscapes. As such, NE have no specific comments to make on the further landscape implications of the proposal	No	Noted.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	[Mitigation enhancement areas] These areas should become features in their own right, complementing the permissive footpaths with seating provided as part of a nature walk.	No	Picnic areas have been proposed through the Development, the majority of which are planned within Work Area 3, Mitigation. The final locations and details of these areas

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				will be confirmed through the ES. Not all mitigation/enhancement areas are suitable for public access (such as skylark plots in the middle of fields that will continue to be farmed). Information boards are proposed at locations around the Development (marked on the masterplan) including some about wildlife, and these will be in proximity to areas improved for wildlife.
Sutton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The permissive footpaths need to be managed, and if the Site is to be promoted as a 'Biodiversity Park' further considerations to make more of a nature trail through/around the park should be secured so that existing and future residents can benefit from these features.	No	The applicant will be responsible for managing PRoW within the Order Limits, this is secured by Technical Appendix A18.1 - Draft

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Recreation Routes Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]**
North Muskham Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The Trent Vale Cycle Route (TVCR5) runs along some of the proposed construction route in Vicarage Lane. This further questions the suitability of the construction route when combined with all of the other points above. The PC suggests that this is reviewed further and incorporated in the proposal.	No	PRoWs within Works Area 3 will connect the recreational network with the enhancement areas created through the Development. Not all mitigation/enhancement areas are suitable for public access (such as skylark plots in the middle of fields that will continue to be farmed). Information boards are proposed at locations around the Development (marked on the masterplan) including some about wildlife, and these will be in proximity

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				to areas improved for wildlife.
North Muskham Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	There is some very positive inclusions of additional permissive footpaths and bridleways within the current proposal and we welcome seeing them realised.	No	Noted.
North Muskham Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	North Muskham Foot Paths No1 and No14 are key amenities for the villagers and it is requested that assurance be given that these will not be closed during the construction or at any time thereafter.	No	No closures are proposed for North Muskham footpaths 1 and 14.
North Muskham Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	North Muskham Foot Path No1 is still shown in the wrong location.	No	The footpaths are shown in the locations provided by Nottinghamshire County Council as the relevant authority.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	This has probably been included to hint at a potential employment benefit to this country due to the use of UK steel.	No	Supply Chain Benefits are to be confirmed in a Procurement/Supply Chain Strategy, until then any supply chain benefits will not be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				included as part of the Assessment due to worst-case scenario evaluation.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The Council note the following proposed security measures. The employment of security guards during the construction phase. It is hoped that ES will contain an approximate assessment of how many person hours will be required to adequately protect the site. This is relevant for the socioeconomic assessment.	No	As part of the employment assessment, indirect employment multipliers are used. Indirect employment will cover roles such as security therefore to avoid double counting and ensure a worst-case scenario RPS will not count specific indirect employment numbers.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Paragraph 83 of Chapter 17 addresses the impact of farm business with the qualification that they are yet to be fully assessed. This is understandable.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The Council are of the view that in terms of explaining financial benefits in the ES, then it should be made clear that all financial benefits mentioned are for landowners, not farmers.	No	This is unsubstantiated as there is dynamism between landowners & farmers. Some landowners within the OL are farmers, others rely on farming tenants to pay their rent. Furthermore, there will be direct farming benefits from sheep grazing opportunities. Overall economic benefit e.g. GVA is not split on a personal basis but measures total economic output generated from the study area.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	It was hoped that as part of the baseline study, the Applicant would identify which of the fields to be panelled is currently farmed by tenant farmers. Unfortunately that baseline data has not been made available.	Yes	A more detailed assessment of the tenancy of the OL fields is included within the ES Chapter 17, Agriculture

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Land **[EN010162/APP/6.2.17]**
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	It is more than likely that the majority of landowners signed up to the scheme, prior to recent changes in inheritance tax (IHT). The Applicant takes a very bullish approach to the farming industry.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	A significant amount of recent media commentary, coupled with large street protests by farmers may be viewed by some as farmers being 'resilient' ie fighting their corner. Others may well see it as genuine concern for the future of the industry.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	It may not be reasonable to expect the ES to complete a comprehensive tax liability projection for the landowners in the scheme. It is possible that the Applicant might take the view that that is a private matter and not the Applicant's problem. However, there does appear to be an argument that a more general assessment is required as part of the socioeconomic impact assessment.	No	This is noted however it is not a mandatory requirement as part of established SEIA methodologies and any attempts will be extremely circumstantial.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Take the example of someone inheriting an 82 hectare farm with 30 hectares leased out to the Applicant with 32 years to run on the lease, bringing in at today's prices £1000 per acre per annum (but coupled to rising electricity prices). Total future expected lease income would be circa £2.4million which would be included in the IHT liability. It is a fair question to ask whether by participating in this project does a landowner now face a greater risk of having to divest assets to meet IHT liabilities than would have been the case had they had continued farming.	No	This is noted however it is not a mandatory requirement as part of established SEIA methodologies and any attempts will be extremely circumstantial.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The Applicant states the site will be grazed by sheep as part of the land management plan (Paragraph 77 Chapter 17). This argument is made nowadays in virtually all solar plant applications. But never is any evidence provided that there is demand for extra grazing land locally.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	By this Council's count, there are currently 11 operational utility scale solar plants in the Newark and Sherwood District area and two just over the border with Bassetlaw. It seems likely that there will be a further 3 constructed locally in the near future (Weston, Muskham Wood and Knapthorpe). Of these 14 in the	Yes	Noted and these schemes come with the benefits of offering a decarbonised energy grid, energy security, Biodiversity Net Gain,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		District, 12 stated in their planning applications there would be sheep grazing in the panel fields. The GNR development will occupy more land than the above 14 combined.		and the associated economic benefits for the area.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	This Applicant actually goes further than most with the sheep grazing arguments and sees it as an agricultural employment gain, concluding that because they expect 5,488 sheep to graze on the panel fields during the operational phase, then that would deliver 10 direct FTE jobs per annum.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Firstly, these sheep farmers are presumably already employed as such (or self-employed). The new jobs will either be new entrants (competitors) or extra staff taken on by the existing sheep farmers.	No	The sheep grazing methodology is explained in detail in the Assessment and is robust.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	DEFRA produce annual figures each June for livestock volumes for the UK. According to those figures, the number of sheep in the UK declined by 1.8% in the year to June 2022. The following twelve months saw a further drop of 4.1% and the twelve months to June 2024 saw yet another reduction of 4.3%. In other words, in the last 3 years there has been a drop in sheep numbers of 10%. The number of sheep in the	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		UK is at its lowest since 2011 and is projected in modelling by AHDB to continue to fall up to 2030. They also state that "The predicted size of the lamb crop for the 2024 – 25 season (March - March), now sits at 15.9m head. This is a decline of 185,000 head from the previous season, representing a fall of 1.2% ".		
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The demand for UK grazing land is actually falling and that trend will continue.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	There were several flocks of sheep seen grazing in open fields whilst travelling between the sites. In the case of Forest Lane, they were actually grazing in an open field next to the solar plant. All six had included the promise of grazing in their planning applications to the Newark and Sherwood District Council Planning Committee. Not one of them had sheep in them.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	It is highly unlikely there are enough sheep locally to populate all the current and planned solar plants and with sheep numbers dropping each year, that gap will become even more pronounced.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Given all the above, the Council believe that the ES should contain firm and reliable evidence that there is a major planned and achievable increase in the local flocks during the operational phase. Alternatively, the Applicant could demonstrate that, whereas nationally the trend in sheep numbers is down, there has been a substantial year on year increase in sheep numbers in the Newark and Sherwood area, meaning that they have outgrown available grazing land. Without such evidence, the credibility of the promise of 10 FTE jobs and the use of sheep as a land management mechanism is severely weakened.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	What the appendix does not do is provide baseline information on local leisure and tourism businesses despite the acknowledgement that any impacts on these must be assessed as per national policies.	No	The SEIA assesses impacts on the visitor economy and references the ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** which assesses local leisure amenities.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	A baseline study is not the correct vehicle for assessing the likely impacts on these businesses. Instead it should hopefully inform on the presence of leisure and tourism assets, particularly within the order limits, that might be impacted by the development. The appendix adopts an over-restrictive definition of tourism receptors as just those within Newark Town Centre, Southwell and Sherwood Forest.	No	The SEIA assesses impacts on the visitor economy and references the ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** which assesses local leisure amenities.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The effects on short term lets, part informed by a basic graphic from AirDNA, is summarised as being disregarded because there are not many of these properties, compared to Southwell and Newark. So in other words, they can be forgotten about. How consistent this is with the Applicant's promise of a "detailed assessment" is not clear.	No	A detailed assessment on "Temporary Workers Accommodation" has been conducted within the SEIA.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	A check of Booking.com and Airbnb reveals some short term holiday lets which will be heavily impacted by the development.	No	A detailed assessment on "Temporary Workers Accommodation" has been conducted within the SEIA.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Short term holiday lets are of course just one type of business likely to be affected.	No	A detailed assessment on "Temporary Workers Accommodation" has been conducted within the SEIA.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	There is no baseline data on caravan parks, glamping sites, angling lakes, retail or licensed premises or commercial stables and riding schools.	No	The SEIA assesses impacts on the visitor economy in relation to the Development and references the ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** which assesses local leisure amenities.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The argument has been voiced locally that the Applicant has included so much demographic detail in order to disguise the fact that it will not address any impacts on local leisure and tourism small businesses. The Council do not express a view on this. Clearly, new baseline data will be required for the ES.	No	The SEIA assesses impacts on the visitor economy and references the ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** which assesses local leisure amenities.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The socioeconomic impacts of this project can be divided into four categories – local, regional, national and international.		Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	This is offset to a degree by disadvantages such a reduction in food production and by higher material imports, negatively affecting the balance of trade.	No	This is not an argument made in the ES.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The impact to all who wander out from the boundaries of the village, whether that be to walk their dogs, enjoy a countryside stroll, exercise, improve their mental health and wellbeing or even take a relaxing drive, will have their experience radically impeded.	No	32km of new route will be created within the Development, enhancing the overall connectivity of the area, particularly between neighbouring villages. A number of the routes are set back from solar PV areas, and will not be impacted by views of panels. Where routes run adjacent to solar panels,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				a minimum corridor of 10 m will be in place between the fence line for any existing or new recreational route. The fence line will have a minimum offset of 3 m from solar panels, more typically 5 m, further distancing routes from panels. New and existing hedgerows will be maintained at approximately 2.5 m, with new trees incorporated throughout where appropriate, screening views of panels from the route.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The large swathes of solar arrays which any visitor will have to drive through to enjoy these assets will significantly detract from any pleasurable excursion.	No	The majority of fields within the development are defined by mature hedgerows, which screen the majority of views from adjacent roads. Panels will be further screened by additional planting. 31% of the Order Limits are Works Area 3, Mitigation/Enhancement, and will enhance the quality of views from the current baseline.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The village of Carlton on Trent is bounded to the east by the river Trent and has no specific recreational facilities provided for local inhabitants and children.	No	Areas to the east of Calton on Trent are outside the Order Limits and the recreational study area, and therefore the applicant has no control over it.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Recreational activities are based on access to the land around the village and the open countryside, public rights of way and bridleways this affords.	No	Noted.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	In particular, the land to the west of the village and to the west of the A1 comprises the majority of this access. This is the area proposed for the solar panels.	No	NT|Carlton-On-Trent|FP10 would be entirely closed and NT|Carlton-On-Trent|FP6 would have 220 m of the 600 m route closed but would be replaced by 550 m of footpath which would follow the edge of the solar PV area. A section of the diverted route would form part of the GNR CLDR. The route would be more direct and continue to provide a connection between the adjacent unnamed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				roads and the wider PRoW network. Additionally, a new permissive route is proposed linking NT|Carlton-On-Trent|FP11, NT|Carlton-On-Trent|FP10, and NT|Carlton-On-Trent|FP6. The route would add 750 m of new route, and in combination with the existing network, would create a 2 km loop around the area, avoiding extended road walking on the unnamed road at grid reference 479121E 364140N.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The proposals require that existing footpaths be re-routed in large part and be screened from the solar farm facilities by fences, hedges and tree plantings. There is concern that the open views enjoyed by walkers, cyclists and horse riders will be lost for a very long period of time.	No	Where routes run adjacent to solar panels, a minimum corridor of 10 m will be in place between the fence line for any existing or new recreational route. The fence line will have a minimum offset of 3 m from solar panels, more typically 5 m, further distancing routes from panels. New and existing hedgerows will be maintained at approximately 2.5 m, with new trees incorporated throughout where appropriate, screening views of panels from the route. The additional routes will provide improved off-

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				road connection to surrounding villages and improved access to open areas outside of works area 1, solar PV.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	A number of residents within the parish work on the land and are set to lose hours and/or employment.	No	A full Employment Assessment has been conducted within the SEIA.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The report could be clearer as to how the proposed infrastructure would ensure specific benefit to the targeted labour markets and industries.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The opportunity to engage this development as a national scheme to benefit innovation in local and regional industries has not been fully explored by the preliminary report.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	It is recommended that the report is clearer on the specific business energy savings and skills benefits that will arise from the scheme.	No	The SEIA references TA A13.2 Employment and Skills Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]** which explores in further detail skills benefits that will arise from the scheme.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	It is felt that alignment with future digital needs for the local economy and reduction to energy bills for business needs further consideration.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The scope of economic impact is not limited to solar panel farm markets or the tourism sector.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The concentration of land control proposed by the size and shape of this development proposal could exacerbate economic disparities, as smaller businesses and lower-income individuals may find it harder to access affordable land.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The environmental assessment should address how the development will not have adverse competition effects on markets wider than the energy industry.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	With respect to apprenticeships, the proposals should include a plan for retention of talent.	No	The SEIA references TA A13.2 Employment and Skills Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]** which explores in further detail skills benefits that will arise from the scheme.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	In terms of skills and supply chain opportunities, a good set of general measures have been referenced in the technical appendix.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The reference to 25% immediate displacement and 75% long term displacement is concerning.	No	All SEIA assessments are based on a worst-case scenario approach.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The Council has a skills policy which aims to put local people first and avoid further labour market displacements – hence there is need for a talent retention policy.	No	The SEIA references TA A13.2 Employment and Skills Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]** which explores in further detail skills benefits that will arise from the scheme.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	There is a high potential to boost local manufacturing trades through the supply chain, and provision of new manufacturing, and potential to address gaps in the construction sector for UK made goods and services. The longevity of this does not seem to be reflected in the displacement levels being assumed during and after the project.	No	Supply Chain Benefits are to be confirmed in a Procurement/Supply Chain Strategy, until then any supply chain benefits will not be included as part of the Assessment due to worst-case scenario evaluation.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The tourism industry impacts need to be addressed more strongly as a vulnerable industry post pandemic and this should go beyond the area being made more visitable through active travel in the long term.	No	The SEIA assesses impacts on the visitor economy and references the Recreation Chapter

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				which assesses local leisure amenities.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	We need to sustain businesses during the construction as well.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	A suspension while work takes place may not be recoverable for many existing businesses especially in this sector.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	NSDC will provide comment on local businesses impacted by the whole project being built in one phase, over two years, with potential for delays.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The Council is a key stakeholder in this agenda and will want to engage on any forward plans locally.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Public Rights of Way (PROW) are the minor highway element of the public highway network and are afforded the same level of protection and control as the major highway network (i.e. all classes of roads in including motorways). They are a material condition in the planning process and due attention should be made to the treatment of them in the application for development	No	Noted.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	daily, equestrians utilise Hagg Lane Bridleway, transiting a circular route from Egmanton Village. This route does fall into the order limits and the use of Moorhouse Road (Link 11) as a transit path north of Hagg Lane will undoubtedly result in construction traffic coming into contact with horses. Our map shows the two Bridleways (marked in Purple) both intersecting Western Road and Hagg Lane. Indeed, Gypsy Lodge houses stable facilities permitting equestrian access directly onto Moorhouse Road.	No	NT|Egmanton|BW5 falls within the recreational study area and is assessed with chapter 18, recreation. Moorhouse and Weston Road fall outside of the recreational study area. They are over 250 m from the Order Limits are not expected to be impacted by the development.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	as will the effect on tourism especially accommodation /hospitality sectors including our café and ice cream parlour and farm shop.	No	The SEIA assesses impacts on the visitor economy and references the Recreation Chapter which assesses local leisure amenities.
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Other socio-economic impacts will be the queuing traffic at certain times on our main roads particularly on Mondays and Fridays when a large local employer Center parcs and Forest holidays have their changeover days. We also would like you to consider the potential lack of employment particularly in agriculture and associated industries.	No	The SEIA references conclusions from the Traffic and Transport Chapter **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. Furthermore, the temporary cessation of agricultural employment has been assessed in detail within the SEIA.
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The fields to be panelled within the parish currently provide natural habitats for protected species which will be lost (ground nesting birds such as lapwing and skylarks) or severely altered. Although not a favoured pursuit of all, our land is used by the Readyfield bloodhounds and also the Grove and Rufford hunt, this pursuit is part of our heritage and removing these	No	Potential effects to wildlife, including ground nesting birds, are assessed in ES Chapter 8,Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		panelled field from their rides restricts and puts more pressure on remaining land. We also have game bird breeding areas which might need relocating.		which includes details of mitigation, compensation, and enhancement. The oCEMP (Technical Appendix A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) and oLEMP (Technical Appendix A5.1 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.1])** provide further details of these measures. No significant adverse effects are predicted.
Maplebeck Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The residents unanimously rejected the proposal for a visitors centre near the village (what three words location variation.confident.having) some park benches on some foot paths would be a more welcome proposal.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Maplebeck Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	It was acknowledged that introducing more footpath and bridleway was a good thing but access points to footpath and cycle routes should be via swing gates to allow disabled access whilst preventing use by motorbikes/ off road vehicles.	No	Gates and means of access will be agreed with Nottinghamshire County Council Rights of Way team.
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The Averham footpaths 2, 6, Kelham footpath 4, 7 and bridleway 3 will all be impacted.	No	Each of these routes are assessed within ES chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**
Eakring Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Eakring has an extensive network of Public Rights of Way (PROW) including lanes, tracks and footpaths associated with the long maintained open field system of farming. The Robin Hood Way, long distance path passes by the panels as does the existing footpath to Maplebeck a walk enjoyed by many generations of Eakring residents.	No	Each of these routes are assessed within ES chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18**
Eakring Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The roads through Eakring particularly the proposed access route is regularly used for charity bike rides as it is part of a designated quiet cycle route. The PROW provide uninterrupted views across open countryside which will be lost by the proposed panels and infrastructure. Fencing, CCTV, panels and other	No	The nature of current views and changes to the views arising from the proposed Development are considered in ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		industrial infrastructure associated with the solar farm will detract from the enjoyment of using the PROW and will negatively impact the wellbeing of our community.		chapter 7, Landscape and Visual Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. The effects on recreational routes are assessed in ES chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18**
Eakring Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The Parish Council objects to the deletion of the footpath in field DB015 as it is a historic route.	No	NT|Eakring|FP13 is diverted to avoid work no. 1, solar PV. NT|Eakring|FP13 would be entirely closed and replaced with 420 m of footpath which would follow the edges of the solar PV area. The route would be more direct and continue to provide a connection between footpath NT|Eakring|FP13 and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				NT|Eakring|FP16. Each of these routes are assessed within ES chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18**
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The social and economic effects on the local community are immeasurable and are not considered as a positive outcome.	No	Noted.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	This we understand will be an un-gated and unmanned open area with interpretive boards, a few picnic tables as well as a car park. This Parish Council and our Parishioners are totally against the positioning of this in its entirety. Experience over many years has taught us that an un-policed, unlocked areas in the countryside ,will attract anti-social behaviour, fly tipping and general uncollected rubbish, unauthorised traveller camps, access issues to other areas, loss of agricultural use of land and a negative cumulative impact of the area. Furthermore, there are no other amenities in the vicinity that would get anywhere near	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		being of use to this fantasy. More alarming is that when we discussed this matter with Mark Noone at both the meeting held in the Parish in July 2024 and in subsequent conversations, we were assured that this visitor centre would not be in the plan at the location shown or anywhere in or near this Parish. It needs to be completely removed.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The permissive routes form part of the Circular Route3 provided as a benefit of the scheme. The Circular Route has been described as utilising both permissive routes, roads, and existing PRoW to form a continuous circular route. If the permissive routes are removed at the decommissioning stage than the Circular Route would either be rerouted onto roads potentially becoming unsafe or would be incomplete in places. This has a potential knock-on effect to Interpretation Boards and carparking. Permissive Routes cannot be part of the Embedded Enhancement Measures4if they are to be removed. Further clarification on this is required.	No	All permissive routes and development infrastructure, including information boards, will be removed upon the decommissioning of the development. The status of diversions in place throughout the operational phase following decommissioning will be decided as part of the Decommissioning and Restoration Plan, prior to decommissioning, in

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				consultation with local authorities and landowners. The permissive routes proposed are for the duration of the operational phase and are enhancement measures for that phase of the Development.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	In respect of Chapter 13 (Socio Economics and Tourism) Paragraph 13.8 onwards considers the potential for job creation during the construction and operational phase of the proposed development.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Whilst noting that the chapter is a technical assessment, there are number of variables that are discussed and applied within this section of the chapter, before presenting the equivalent FTE jobs that are potentially likely to be generated by the proposed development. It may be beneficial to include a table which presents this data in a clearer form and as a summary, as per Table 13.19.	No	Clarity in presenting economic benefit data e.g. jobs has been included within Chapter 13, Socio-Economics and Tourism **[EN010162/APP/6.2.13]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	NSDC note that during the operational stage of the development, once all factors are applied, the proposed development will potentially generate an overall net gain in employment as a result of the proposed development of 166 direct local FTE jobs. This positive effect is assessed as being 'moderate beneficial' but given the scale and extent of the proposed development, NSDC consider this to be a low number, in relation to other comparable solar NSIP schemes. Whilst the assessment acknowledges there is some uncertainty associated with the conclusions at this stage, NSDC consider that the Applicant should demonstrate in a robust manner, how the proposal will generate and maximise job creation leading up to and during the construction stage (should permission be given for the proposed development) of the proposed development. Whilst noting that the applicant is currently drafting an Outline Employment and Skills Plan, NSDC are keen to understand the likely content of this plan and therefore the extent to which a mechanism is in place to deliver such jobs, for the benefit of the NSDC area.	No	All SEIA assessments are based on a worst-case scenario approach and the methodology is clearly explained within the SEIA. Further detail on the now completed Employment and Skills Plan can be seen TA A13.2 Employment and Skills Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.13.2]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Similarly, during the construction phase of the development, there is a potential net increase of 21 FTE jobs, which is noted within the assessment as being 'minor beneficial'. Whilst noting that job creation is typically lower during the operation phase of the development, the Applicant should equally consider how job creation can be maximised and secured during the significant and long-term operational phase of the proposed development.	No	All SEIA assessments are based on a worst-case scenario approach.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Further to this, NSDC would also encourage the applicant to consider how the above-mentioned mitigation measures, could link to the potential socioeconomic benefits of the proposed development in respect of FTE jobs (directly and indirectly created) during the construction phase of the proposed development, so as to maximise localised job and related economic benefits to the advantage of the NSDC area and its community.	No	All SEIA assessments are based on a worst-case scenario approach.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	In respect of Recreation, as this chapter focusses on PrOW, we have agreed that NCC as the responsible authority for the definitive PrOW routes within the county will respond on this matter. NSDC would however ask that the Applicant also carefully consider	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		any additional comments made from the local community on this issue and respond accordingly.		
Natural England	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	NE welcome the commitment to the provision of an outline Public Rights of Way Management Plan (PRoWMP) that will be prepared for the DCO application submission, as part of the ES.	No	Noted.
Natural England	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	We acknowledge and welcome section 18.6 which details that the layout of the development has been designed with the aim of minimising the effects on Public Rights of Way (PRoW).	No	Noted.
Natural England	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	Natural England welcome the commitment to 'Embedded Enhancement Measures' within the Development design to enhance recreation receptors and/or the experience of using them, as detailed in Table 18.3. Enhancement Measures include the following; woodland, hedgerow and tree planting, circular route, permissive routes, interpretation (e.g. information boards), wayfinding and access, hubs, picnic areas and a community orchard.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Natural England	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	The value of these enhancement measures is recognised and encouraged by NE due to their ability for increased public understanding of the project and surrounding natural environment.	No	Noted.
Natural England	Socioeconomics, tourism and recreation	NE have been engaged regarding the elements of the proposals, and indeed actions outside of the proposals, regarding connecting people with nature; whilst our statutory advice will not provide further comment on this, we remain keen to continue this non-statutory engagement, to help the opportunities for Connecting People with Nature to be realised.	No	Noted.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	The PC are pleased to see that our suggestion to re-route southbound A1 traffic further south to the Ashiana/Nelson Lane roundabout and back north to gain access to Vicarage Lane has been included in the latest plans. Can EG please confirm that this is indeed the proposed route and that traffic will not access south into the top of Main Street North Muskham?	Yes	Solar arrays in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so no construction traffic will route via North Muskham.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	Whilst the rerouting as described above is welcome this does not in any way infer that the PC believe that Vicarage Lane is suitable for heavy constructions traffic. It is narrow and has no pavements and would	Yes	Solar arrays in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so no construction

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		requires significant investment in road infrastructure to accommodate the current proposal. Vicarage Lane in on the route of the very busy level crossing over the East Coast Main Line.		traffic will route via Vicarage Lane.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	Given extensive local knowledge the PC are well aware of the high frequency of accidents, delays, roadworks etc. on the A1 and the associated effect on traffic through the village. Contingency plans for these highly likely scenarios are not adequately provided in the documentation and a clear plan for this is required to include enforcement measures.	Yes	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Technical Appendix A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV deliveries will be paused when an 'abnormal incident' has occurred on the network, such as road closures due to accidents or flooding, and will not commence until traffic conditions returned to 'normal'. The requirements of the CTMP **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** will be a contractual

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				obligation and any non-compliance would be a breach or contract with penalties.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	The A46 Newark by-pass upgrade is also likely to be being constructed on a similar timeframe as well as other Solar Farms already in the local planning process. The impact on all proposed routes needs to acknowledge this and prepare plans accordingly.	No	Measures to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from the solar park site are included in the Outline Travel Plan (Technical Appendix A14.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.2]** and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (Technical Appendix A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** . Prior to the start of construction, final versions of these documents will take into account any cumulative

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				development construction activity in the area that could overlap with Development traffic, such as the A46 Newark bypass works.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	The PC feel that the documentaton makes assumptions that only commercial vehicles, pedestrians and cyclists will use Vicarage Lane and Bathley Lane. The documentation does not take into account agricultural vehicles or cars and vans sharing the road. Delivery vehicles may well meet on the road when dropping off and leaving between the site and the A1 or East Coast Main Line (ECML). Horses, cyclists and walkers also use this route and there is a stable nearby.	Yes	Solar arrays in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so no construction traffic will route via Vicarage Lane.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	Further calculations of road widths throughout the route on Vicarage Lane is requested as those stated thus far do not appear to match those on the ground. Further assurances are required that the routes would realistically be able to support the stipulations set out in	Yes	Solar arrays in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so no construction traffic will route via Vicarage Lane.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the Highways code given likely traffic volumes and types.		
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	Residents remain concerned about construction vehicles re-routing or causing obstructions etc. If and when things do go wrong, or questions are raised, the PC would like to know that there is a contact number and real person that can be contacted straightaway to get an explanation or resolution. Ideally this would be a reasonably local site office that is manned and has the authority to resolve local issues.	Yes	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that the details of a contact person will be made available to residents.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	To assist with enforcement the PC request that a Automatic Number Plate Recognition (ANPR) camera system is provided in North Muskham. This would need to be installed to cover entry points at the A1 south entry onto Main Street at the north end of the village to facilitate enforcement of the 7.5 tonne HGV restricQons in the village by NCC Highways and act as a deterrent to drivers.	Yes	Solar arrays in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so no construction traffic will route via North Muskham.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	The Highways authority have recently objected to a proposal for a adjacent solar farm that uses much of the same route along Vicarage Lane and it is suggested that an alternative route is found.	Yes	Solar arrays in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so no construction

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				traffic will route via Vicarage Lane.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	The PC remain surprised that there is little mention of the East Coast Main Line (ECML) rail level crossing on Vicarage Lane known as Norwell Crossing which is on the proposed route. The level crossing at Vicarage Lane is extremely active give the number of trains on the ECML. This means that the crossing can be down for long stretches of time as several trains pass by. On other occasions the crossing remains open for extremely brief periods of only a few seconds before shuttng again. This can and does lead to tail backs onto the roundabout at Vicarage Lane and/or at Bathley Lane, especially when combined with delays on the A1.	Yes	Solar arrays in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so no construction traffic will route via Vicarage Lane.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	It is noted that the Bathley Lane (ECML) rail level crossing is not being proposed but this needs to be strictly enforced given the dangers associated with any of the crossings and HGV traffic. Can EG clarify how this will be enforced?	Yes	Solar arrays in this area has now been removed from the Order Limits and so no construction traffic will route via Bathley Lane. Construction traffic will be required to adhere to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				the routes identified in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** which will be a contractual requirement.
North Muskham Parish Council	Transport and access	The PC suggest that further safety arrangements are incorporated To avoid contact with overhead cables, breakdowns on or near the crossing etc. In addition, further steps should be considered to avoid vehicles (particularly long vehicles) from mis-timing their crossing. A plan for affecting and enforcing this should be included.	No	The overhead cables on the ECML are noted and the HGV routing will not pass over the section with reduced clearance (4.1m). Long vehicles will be expected to adhere to road safety good practice and not pass over the crossing until clear and safe to do so.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	We are not aware of any detail of the schedule of work to deliver the project and would request the Noise Risk Assessment for the activities is made available to include the mitigation and constraints placed on the	No	Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**, presents the findings of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		construction activity with regard to third party exposure, including wildlife.		an assessment of the likely significant effects from noise and vibration as a result of the Development. Where required, this chapter identifies measures to address potential impacts and likely significant effects of the scheme in terms of noise and vibration during the construction, operation, and decommissioning phases. This chapter is supported by the following TAs, in Volume 4 of this ES: • TA A5.2 Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				(oCTMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**; • TA A5.3 Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (oCEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**; and • TA A5.6 Outline Decommissioning and Restoration Plan (oDRP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]**.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	There is concern at noise and traffic nuisance over extended periods, outside the normal working day and on public holidays. Assurances are sought that this will be robustly addressed, monitored and restrictions observed.	No	As detailed in Chapter 12: Noise and Vibration of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**, consideration of vibration from traffic movements during construction is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				presented in section 12.4.6. This approach was discussed and agreed with the NSDC Environmental Health Officer. In addition, Section 14.7.3 of Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport, **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** confirms that traffic movements during decommissioning are not anticipated to exceed the number set out for the construction phase. As such, decommissioning noise would be no more than the levels assessed in section 12.7.1.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	The detailed construction traffic management plan for Moorhouse and Laxton is awaited. The initial summary note produced by Systra for Ossington includes Moorhouse but lacks detail.	No	The initial traffic summary note contained information that was available at the time. A more detailed consideration is now included in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**, ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	It is understood that traffic through Moorhouse will supply about 150 hectares and, including Ossington, nearer 300 hectares. This appears to equate to 675 construction days, with 1530 Articulated HGV	Yes	The access strategy for this area now includes the use of an internal haul road so HGV traffic does not pass through

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		movements, 1950 rigid HGV movements and 3000 LGV movements.		Ossington / Moorhouse. ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** provides the revised forecast of the increased traffic levels on the road network.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	The roads through Moorhouse are single/narrow track, generally of tarmac construction, in poor condition and suffering significantly from flooding, erosion and lack of repair.	Yes	Additional passing places are now proposed along Moorhouse Road to the north. These are shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. Also, the access strategy for this area now includes the use of an internal haul road so HGV traffic does not pass through Ossington /

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Moorhouse. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Of particular concern are the ancient bridges on the route through Moorhouse which should be assessed for suitability. Pasing points have yet to be identified.	Yes	The access strategy for this area now includes the use of an internal haul road so HGV traffic does not pass through Ossington / Moorhouse. Passing places are now shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**.
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	On these single/narrow-track roads, movement at this volume will be very disruptive for any community, and potentially devastating for a small residential village	No	Measures to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from the solar park site are included in the Outline Travel Plan (TA A14.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.2]** and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				. Passing places are proposed along the routes being used for construction where the road widths do not currently comfortably accept HGV traffic and these are shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. This will ease two-way traffic flows. Consideration of the effects of the Development on issues such as severance, amenity, and fear and intimidation are included in ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	In addition, damage to the already poorly maintained roads has significant potential to render these roads unusable bringing further disruption to the locality.	No	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	These factors give cause for significant concern regarding the ability of emergency services to access the community, the ability of residents to move freely and the low-level vehicle damage that will inevitably occur when concurrently using these increasingly damaged roads with works traffic and being forced to detour to accommodate the HGVs' passage.	No	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Laxton and Moorhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	The reduction in the number of fields sought above will aid the management of the noise and traffic issues identified.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and Access	Waste collection and disposal quantification is not assisted by Chapter 14 (Traffic) or Appendix 14 (transport) as there are no associated trip attractions.	No	When forecasting traffic movements, robust assumptions are considered to determine a worst-case and this includes an allowance for miscellaneous items. It should also be noted that the traffic volumes assessed within ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** are for the expected peak month of traffic activity.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse	Transport and Access	The expected workforce assumed numbers – 400 workers on average for 500 days. With the only calculated waste for site removal being aggregate,	No	When forecasting traffic movements, robust assumptions are

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council		there is an inbuilt assumption that these 200,000 person days create no waste.		considered to determine a worst-case and this includes an allowance for miscellaneous items. It should also be noted that the traffic volumes assessed within ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** are for the expected peak month of traffic activity.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and Access	Research has been completed from a wide variety of sources. A fair total daily waste production figure per capita is judged to be 0.9kg of which 0.5kg is human waste. Of the remaining 400g, it is estimated that half will be capable of recycling. Human waste would be produced anyway so that is not an additional cost of the project. However, transporting off site for disposal is, as is transporting the bodily waste.	No	When forecasting traffic movements, robust assumptions are considered to determine a worst-case and this includes an allowance for miscellaneous items. It should also be noted that the traffic volumes assessed within ES

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** are for the expected peak month of traffic activity.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	As it stands at the moment, it is not known whether the construction HGVs and the AILs will pass in close proximity to any of the above building types. It is possible that such route examination detail may well be included in the CTMP.	Yes	Figure 14.4: Site Access Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.4]** and Figure 14.7: Abnormal Load Routes **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.7]** within ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** show the proposed routes of HGVs and AILs, respectively.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Paragraph 31- there is no 20mph speed restriction in the village of Norwell.	Yes	Noted. Construction traffic will not route through Norwell.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	A14.1.4.4 Bus Travel. This section does not acknowledge the Nottsbus on demand scheme. This scheme, by its very nature, does not have set routes or timetables. This is a relevant point for the CTMP. For some of the CTMP roads, there will be a wish to avoid construction HGVs meeting wide vehicles in opposition. Nottsbus might cause a problem there.	Yes	Reference is now made to the Nottsbus within ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**. Passing places are proposed along the routes being used for construction where the road widths do not currently comfortably accept HGV traffic and these are shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. This will ease two-way traffic flows. The Outline Construction Traffic

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out that HGV deliveries will be scheduled to occur outside of sensitive periods and therefore minimise traffic impact.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Paragraph 76. Typographical error. A47 should read A46.	Yes	Noted
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Paragraph 79. The A614 is a national speed limit road if one proceeds north from its junction with the A616 near Ollerton. South of this junction, it has a 50mph camera monitored speed limit till just north of Nottingham. This error is repeated in paragraph 115 of Chapter 14.	Yes	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse	Transport and access	Paragraphs 80 and 81. The speed limits are again wrong. Driving south on this road from its junction with the A1, the national speed limit applies until reaching	Yes	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council		South Muskham where a 30mph limit applies up to its junction with the A616. This stretch of road is a key route for construction traffic. This error is repeated in paragraph 117 of Chapter 14.		
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Paragraph 82. 2 key features of this road are that there is 4.1m height restriction and a 7.5 tonne environmental weight restriction.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Paragraph 83. For the stretch of Vicarage lane to be used as the construction access for this development, the speed limit is all 30mph, not the national speed limit.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Paragraph 83. For the stretch of Vicarage lane to be used as the construction access for this development, there is an environmental weight restriction of 7.5 tonnes. This error is repeated in paragraph 118 of Chapter 14 but corrected in Table 14.12.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse	Transport and access	Paragraph 86. Though for the majority of this road, the national speed limit applies, an important section passing through Ossington village is governed by a 30mph limit. This omission also applies to paragraph	Yes	Noted. The access strategy for this area near Ossington

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council		122 of Chapter 14 but is mentioned in Table 14.12 in that chapter. This stretch of road is a key route for construction traffic. Here, it has the capacity to cause significant adverse impacts. There will be many who feel that a 3058% increase in HGV movements through this village is too high an adverse impact.		and Moorhouse has been reconsidered post-PEIR and now includes the use of an internal haul road so HGV traffic does not pass through Ossington / Moorhouse. ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** considers the severity of impacts resulting from construction traffic.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	With regard to TA A05.2, there is a typographical error in Table A5.2.4 substituting Cromwell with Cramwell.	No	Noted.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse	Transport and access	It is appreciated that the CTMP is work in progress. One of the more challenging traffic movement plans will be the Abnormal Indivisible Loads (AIL). TA A05.2 makes an initial assessment on potential route	No	Figure 14.7: Abnormal Load Routes **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.7]** within ES Chapter 14,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council		suitability. It is not possible to analyse these routes as, though paragraph 70 of A05.2 states that the routes being considered are shown at Figure A5.2.3, there is no such figure.		Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** show the proposed routes for AIL movements and Appendix E of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** provides AIL route assessment reports by a AIL transportation specialist.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	The implication from paragraph 69 of A05.2 is that the heaviest AIL will be 180te net weight. No figure is yet provided for the estimated maximum loaded gross vehicle weight. In the absence of the aforementioned figure, guidance has been sought from the Highways Agency Heavy and High Routes publication.	No	Noted. The maximum gross weight of vehicles will be established when the specialist AIL transportation company have selected the most appropriate vehicle available at the time. This will be agreed with the relevant authorities

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				confirmed and included in the detailed version of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** .
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	The implication from paragraph 69 of A05.2 is that the heaviest AIL will be 180te net weight. No figure is yet provided for the estimated maximum loaded gross vehicle weight. In the absence of the aforementioned figure, guidance has been sought from the Highways Agency Heavy and High Routes publication.	No	Noted. The maximum gross weight of vehicles will be established when the specialist AIL transportation company have selected the most appropriate vehicle available at the time. This will be agreed with the relevant authorities confirmed and included in the detailed version of the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2] .
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Broadgate Lane is shown as a possible diversion route for the closure of Caunton Road (between the A616 and A617). There is a strong argument that this route would be unsuitable for diverted HGVs. This option is in need of review.	No	Closure of Caunton Lane is not now expected. Notwithstanding, any diversion routes associated with road closures would require to be agreed with the Local Highway Authority.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	This is the first time that it has been implied that construction HGVs will pass through Norwell. The village is not shown on the access route mapping. This may just be an error. Paragraph 85 of Chapter 14 states that Norwell is not on a designated route but paragraphs 157 and 176 of that same chapter reinforce the belief that there will be HGV traffic passing through this village.	No	Construction traffic will not pass through Norwell.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	In the case of one such build, they will be passing within 1m of a Grade 2 listed asset. If HGVs do pass through this village, either by instruction or accident, then there will be a prima facie case that the drivers and the project transport manager will be committing	No	Construction traffic will not pass through Norwell.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		an offence under the Road Traffic 65Regulations Act 1984.		
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Table 14.12 in Chapter 14 provides a description of the B6325, calling it the Great North Road. It wrongly states that the stretch of this road passing through South Muskham is subject to a 40mph speed restriction whereas it is actually 30mph. The description of the road is also misleading. It states there are some commercial property accesses present. At the Council's last count, there are four such accesses, so strictly speaking this is true.	Yes	This Applicant makes note of this comment and has updated the wording in both the ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	What the description does not mention, is the entrance to the children's playground on this road. It also fails to mention the 12 residential driveways joining onto this road, with a further 7 additional dwellings having pedestrian exits to this road. This road is more residential than commercial. With its playground exit onto this road and the majority of buildings being residential, it is believed that the B6325 part of South Muskham should be classified as a sensitive receptor.	Yes	Solar arrays are no-longer proposed in this area and this road is no-longer identified as a route for construction traffic.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Transport and access	Tt might make matters clearer, when referring to this road, if subsequent reports call it the B6325. Referring to it as the Great North Road in this area of the County can sometimes be ambiguous. Other transport related reports submitted by the Applicant refer to it as the B6325.	Yes	Noted.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	Transport and access	Access to the site – minimum of two genuinely independent access routes	No	The BESS has two approaches, as shown in Figures 5.1 and 5.3
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	Transport and access	Can Fire Service vehicles easily access all of the site, SWEPT path analysis undertaken	No	Yes, swept path analysis has been undertaken of all site access points and tracks
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and access	Heavy Goods and other similar supporting vehicles during the construction phase of the project would adversely impact on the condition of already poor road surfaces i.e. potholes	No	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and access	Heavy Goods and other similar supporting vehicles during the construction phase of the project would adversely impact on Village traffic, particularly at times when the rail crossing is in use	No	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV construction deliveries will be scheduled to occur outside of the peak periods. HGV deliveries will also be scheduled to ensure that they are appropriately

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				co-ordinated. Measures to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from the Development are included in the Outline Travel Plan (TA A14.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.2]**
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and access	Heavy Goods and other similar supporting vehicles during the construction phase of the project would adversely impact on Pedestrians, dog walkers and groups plus cyclists.	No	Non-motorised users are considered in the ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and measures are identified in Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** in areas with an increased likelihood of interaction.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and access	Having driven the roads within and bordering the project area it is apparent the roads are totally inadequate (narrow roads with no pavements) for a significant number of HGVs to travel on despite the provision of occasional passing areas for oncoming traffic.	No	The roads used for construction have been informed by desk studies and site visits. In addition to passing places, measures are set in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** that seek to reduce disruption and better facilitate the movement of all road users. The roads and their forecast traffic volumes have then been assessed in ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** using recognised methodologies.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and access	There is therefore a significant increase in the potential for accidents involving vehicular traffic, pedestrians/dog walkers, cyclists and horse riders	No	The ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** considers the interaction of non-motorised users with construction traffic along with a review of road safety. Road safety is also reviewed in the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**. Measures are identified in Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** in areas where there is an increased likelihood of interaction between construction traffic and HGVs - such as reduced

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				speeds for construction vehicles.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and access	Potential for damage to the rail crossing, the road, rails and boom section (height restriction of 5 metres)	No	Any damage to the rail crossing resulting from construction traffic will be done in conjunction with the requirements of Network Rail.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and access	It is anticipated that there is the potential for damage to culverts/dykes and bridges that were constructed at a time when it was not envisaged that there would be a significant increase in HGV's and their design was probably limited to farm and light goods traffic	No	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and access	At times of accidents/incidents on the A1M the village would have increased traffic volumes going through it bringing the obvious risks associated with this	Yes	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV deliveries will be paused when an 'abnormal incident' has occurred on the network, such as accidents/incidents on the A1, and not resume until 'typical' traffic conditions return.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The traffic impact of the development as presented in both the PEIR and the TS fundamentally relies on the developments delivery over 5 phases. However, in Schedule 2, requirement 3 of the draft Development	Yes	ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** now clarifies that

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Control Order requires a minimum of 2 phases and therefore does not represent the development being presented. This requirement should therefore be changed to reflect that which is presented, or the information amended to reflect 2 phases.		although 5 phases are shown, this is a spatial separation, but not necessarily temporal, with phases 1 and 3 being concurrent and 2, 4 and 5 being concurrent. This is equivalent, therefore, to two temporal phases with two or three construction teams operating concurrently.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Traffic Counts are stated as being carried out in April 2024 but neither the specific dates nor the raw data is provided.	Yes	The dates of the traffic surveys are now set out in Section A14.1.5.5 of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**, with the raw data provided in Appendix C.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	As one example, Access 20 indicates a peak 2-way flow of 2.4 vehicles, yet our AADT information for this road shows 500 vehicles per day, from which, as a rough guide, 50 vehicles in peak hour can be assumed.	Yes	Additional traffic surveys have been conducted since PEIR and the dates of all traffic surveys are now set out in Section A14.1.5.5 of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**, with the raw data provided in Appendix C.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	There appears to be a reduction across the board which may not be accounted for by daily variation, and we would require the specific dates of the count and the raw data so that this can be properly considered.	Yes	Additional traffic surveys have been conducted since PEIR and the dates of all traffic surveys are now set out in Section A14.1.5.5 of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**, with the raw data provided in Appendix C.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Information on how the peak flows (referenced in table A14.1.13 Access Locations and SSD within the TS) have been calculated is also required.	Yes	Further information is now provided in the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**, including the calculation of SSDs in Section A14.1.5.5.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The routing diagram shows that to the north of accesses 10 and 11, Kelham Road will be used. This is a narrow unclassified road which also introduces a junction along the route. The routing should be amended to use Ollerton Road to access the A616, which is a wider, classified road.	Yes	Solar arrays are no-longer proposed in this area and these roads are no-longer identified as a route for construction traffic.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The Trent Lane/Kelham Lane identified route links the A616 to Kelham but there is no analysis of its use. It is noted that there is an environmental weight limit on it and it does not appear to provide access to any of the parcels. This should be addressed in any future submission	Yes	Solar arrays are no-longer proposed in this area. These roads will not be used by construction traffic.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	It is assumed that all accesses are intended to serve both the construction phase and operational phase of the development, but this should be made clear.	Yes	The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				1] and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** now sets out the intended use of each access, including if it is for construction and operational phases.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	There does not appear to be any suitable justification provided of the proposed access points.	Yes	This information is now provided in the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Whilst Paragraph 137 of PEIR_CH14 Traffic and Transport states that the land parcels have been grouped into distinct areas that will be served by a designated site access the evidence behind this does not appear to have been made available in a suitable format.	Yes	Figure A14.1.10 - Land Parcel Site Access Assignment within the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** now provides this information.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The Masterplan splits the development over several individual sheets which does not make identification of the parcels easy and does not appear to identify the relevant accesses.	Yes	The sheets are now split into four and presented at a larger scale.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Proper justification of each access is therefore required which should include expected numbers of vehicles accessing them	Yes	This information is now provided in the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** with Appendix F providing forecast traffic numbers for each access.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	We would expect particular attention to be paid to the new accesses but are also concerned about use of existing accesses on the Major Road Network (the A616 and A617).	Yes	The use of accesses onto A roads has been minimised and are their use only proposed where necessary
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	It is considered access should be avoided here to avoid delay to other traffic, and slow-moving construction vehicles turning across heavily trafficked roads.	Yes	The use of accesses onto A roads has been minimised and are their use only proposed where necessary

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	There is also a further query in relation to access to the A617 as the masterplan appears to show 2 accesses but only one is presented in all other information.	No	An access is only proposed to the north. Figure 14.4, Site Access Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.4]** presents their location. Further details are provided with Appendix D of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	A number of the accesses shown are not on public roads. The nearest public junction should therefore be assessed in these instances.	Yes	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Access 33 is an existing highway junction and does not indicate an access to the site.	Yes	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	There are a number of parcels of land which appear to have no proposed access	Yes	Figure A14.1.10 - Land Parcel Site Access Assignment within the Transport Statement (TA

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** now provides information on which access services each area of land.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The applicant should consider land which it appears cannot be accessed in the vicinity of access 9, 19 and 28 and also how the parcel of land between the A616 and Kelham Lane to the south of South Muskham is accessed.	Yes	Solar arrays in this area have now been removed from the Order Limits.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	There are a significant number of the access drawings in Appendix D of the TS where the background mapping is such that it is not possible to identify their location.	Yes	This has been rectified, and location plans now also include an OS reference to allow locations to be confirmed.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The location plan is too small a scale to enable the specific locations to be identified.	Yes	This has been rectified, and location plans now also include an OS reference to allow locations to be confirmed.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	There are also a number of occasions where the routing would allow vehicles to enter or leave in either direction, but only one swept path has been shown. In such instances we would require further swept paths showing all movements or information how this would be controlled to prevent movements.	Yes	Site access drawings showing the swept path analysis are shown in Appendix D of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** and measures within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** setting out how HGV deliveries will be scheduled to avoid two-way movements and where banksman will be deployed.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The swept paths frequently show vehicles overrunning both the opposing verge and surrounding verges. We would welcome clarification if detailed design of all accesses are to be submitted as part of the Requirement 6 of Schedule 2 of the DCO and that the	Yes	The swept path drawing have been refined and are shown in Appendix D of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		accesses are currently only shown indicatively or otherwise		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**. These are outline designs, not detailed designs.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	it is not appropriate to include all data in relation to speeds. Speed data is sometimes provided as 'average 85th%ile' which is not the appropriate way to determine 85th%ile speeds. This should be clarified and addressed if necessary, with the full information presented for audit.	Yes	The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** sets out the use of speed data to inform visibility splays. Raw data is included in Appendix C of the TS.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	It was agreed that we would consider application of MfS standards on roads where it may be considered appropriate, if the accesses were on lightly trafficked and low speed roads for example.	Yes	The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** sets out the use of speed data to inform visibility splays. DMRB standards are now used.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The HA consider that adjacent use and pedestrian activity have no bearing on the required standards for vehicle-to-vehicle visibility splays and there is no	Yes	The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** sets out the use of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		quantification of how it was determined where it is felt roads fell between standards.		speed data to inform visibility splays. DMRB standards are now used.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Tt is clearly set out in MfS2 in 10.1.7 that the SSD values recommended in MfS1 were based on a perception-reaction time of 1.5 seconds and a deceleration rate of 0.45g (4.41 m/s2) which is appropriate for cars and other light vehicles, but heavy goods vehicles (and buses) have different deceleration characteristics and this should therefore be accounted for accordingly and where HGVs make up 5% or more of the traffic, DMRB standards apply. DMRB would also apply on roads with an 85th%ile of 37mph or more.	Yes	The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** sets out the use of speed data to inform visibility splays. DMRB standards are now used.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Whilst there is an outstanding query over the count data in general, fundamentally there are no traffic surveys appropriate to determine the flows and/or the 85th%ile speeds of accesses 1, 2, 7, 9, 12, 16, 17, 18, 24, 25, 26, 27 and 29 where it is stated the 'nearest' available data was used. In some instances the counts relied on appear to be on different roads. The proposed visibility splays cannot therefore be relied on	Yes	Additional traffic surveys have been conducted since PEIR and the dates of all traffic surveys are now set out in Section A14.1.5.5 of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		for any of these accesses and the acceptable application of MfS cannot be considered.		**1]**, with the raw data provided in Appendix C.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	The access layouts shown in Appendix D of the TA refer to 'min visibility.' It is not clear what 'min visibility' is but the figures given do not bear any relation to the table in A14.1.13 and no splays are identified on the drawings. Once the data has been provided and (re)reviewed, the resultant splays are required to be shown on the access drawings.	Yes	The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** sets out the use of speed data to inform visibility splays. DMRB standards are now used.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Reference has been made to an assessment of need for passing places, utilising swept path analysis and visibility. However, this information has not been made available and we cannot therefore consider the acceptability of the proposed passing places.	Yes	Passing place drawings are shown in Appendix E of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** and include the respective visibility spays.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	It is also noted that there appear to be a number of roads identified on the routing plan that are very narrow but have no passing places proposed.	Yes	Additional passing places are now proposed, and all passing places are shown on Figure 14.5 of ES Chapter 14, Traffic &

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. In addition, the access strategy for areas near Ossington, Moorhouse and Mablebeck now includes the use of an internal haul road to remove HGV traffic from the network as soon as possible.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	We note that paragraph 157 refers to CTMP and states that dilapidation will be made good for any defects directly attributable to construction traffic. This will be difficult to evidence and so should be amended to defects reasonably attributed to construction traffic.	Yes	Text has now been amended to reflect this comment.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Furthermore, the construction in each phase will go on for a number of months. At access points in particular, where movements could be considered extraordinary, braking and turning heavy vehicles are known to cause damage and disturb the road surface and/or verges, creating hazards for road users. A rolling review and	Yes	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing, roads to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		plan for remedial action for damage caused should therefore be included in the CTMP.		be used for construction will be subject to a condition survey and any remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and access	Paragraph 112 refers to identifying and remedying potholes prior to construction commencing. The document should identify who is intended to be responsible for this.	No	These works would be undertaken by the Applicant, in agreement with NCC
National Fire Chiefs Council	Transport and access	Suitable facilities for safely accessing and egressing the site should be provided. Designs should be developed in close liaison with the local FRS as specific requirements may apply due to variations in vehicles and equipment. This should include:	No	As detailed in Chapter 14: Traffic and Transport, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**, for determining the most

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		- At least 2 separate access points to the site to account for opposite wind conditions/direction. -Roads/hard standing capable of accommodating fire service vehicles in all weather conditions. As such there should be no extremes of grade. -A perimeter road or roads with passing places suitable for fire service vehicles. - Road networks on sites must enable unobstructed access to all areas of the facility. - Turning circles, passing places etc size to be advised by FRS depending on fleet.		appropriate construction route, the land parcels that comprise the Development have been grouped into distinct areas that will each be served by a designated site access. The most appropriate route to that site access from the A1 trunk road has then been considered, whilst acknowledging that some traffic may possibly also route from the west. Using the above hierarchy as the guiding principle, the route to each site access also considers: • The shortest route; • Seeks to avoid sensitive areas so far

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				as possible, such as schools and villages; • Uses roads of appropriate width and alignment; and • Utilises internal haul roads where suitable and convenient. 144. When it is not viable to achieve the above, additional mitigation measures will be implemented and these are discussed in the "oCTMP" (TA A5.2 **[EN01062/APP/6.4.5.2]**).
Forestry Commission	Transport and access	For example, the effect of air pollution from development that can result from a significant increase in traffic or dust from construction. There is a need to consider both the direct and indirect impacts resulting from construction.	No	ES chapter 16, Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** includes an assessment of effects on air quality

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and from dust, and finds no significant effects, with further mitigation being provided in ES Technical Appendix A5.3, Outline Construction Environmental Management Plan (CEMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]** .
National Highways	Transport and access	As the site shares a common boundary with the A1 trunk road, it shall be necessary to consider the potential boundary related impacts on our network.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Transport and access	A significant element of the information within the PEIR is based upon small scale maps of the whole, or significant areas of, the Development. Only high-level and general comments are possible from this level of information. More detailed information covering the impact of the development proposals on National Highways assets and interests will need to be provided, ideally with relevant information extracted	Yes	Figures have now been provided at an increased scale. The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** sets out the traffic generation forecasts for the construction phase.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		from the multiple reports and appendices to form a more focused consultation.		Importantly, the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**) also sets out the hours of operations and restrictions of HGV deliveries to avoid the road network peak periods and thus reduce the impact on the SRN and local roads.
National Highways	Transport and access	In addition, our comments of 14 November 2023 stated that we will wish to ensure that the development proposal, including its construction, does not unduly impact any of National Highways' construction works, for instance, the A46 Newark Bypass scheme. The A46 Newark Bypass is a key component of National Highways' investment program to enhance major road networks. The proposed improvements include widening the existing single carriageway to a dual carriageway between the Farndon and Winthorpe	No	Measures to reduce the number of vehicles travelling to and from the solar park site are included in the Outline Travel Plan (TA A14.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.2]** and Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		roundabouts near Newark-on-Trent. National Highways expects a decision on the Development Consent Order (DCO) in Q4 2025, with major construction work scheduled to begin in 2026. The project is anticipated to be open to traffic by 2029.		A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** . Prior to the start of construction, final versions of these documents will take into account any cumulative development construction activity in the area that could overlap with Development traffic.
National Highways	Transport and access	The proposed solar park is in the vicinity of the A1 and A46 trunk roads, which are part of the SRN. We acknowledge that there will be 34 access points into the solar park area, none of which shall take direct access from the SRN, however a number of existing SRN junctions are in close proximity to the proposed access points and are expected to experience an increased traffic demand from the proposed development.	No	The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** sets out the traffic generation forecasts for the construction phase. Importantly, the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				also sets out the hours of operations and restrictions of HGV deliveries to avoid the road network peak periods and thus reduce the impact on the SRN and local roads.
National Highways	Transport and access	Assuming the construction works is carried out as scheduled, the maximum traffic impact from the construction traffic is expected in 2028. We therefore recommend that background growth rates derived from TEMPro be applied to the 2024 surveyed traffic flow for further assessment. We also recommend that the latest version 8.1 of TEMPro be used, and that traffic growth be NTM adjusted.	Yes	TEMPro growth factors have now been applied within assessments when considering future baseline
National Highways	Transport and access	We acknowledge that a Construction Traffic Management Plan (CTMP) will be implemented during the construction phase and National Highways should be consulted on this. The CTMP should cover the anticipated construction traffic flow during AM and PM peak hours in the month when the maximum	No	The Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** sets out the traffic generation forecasts for the construction phase.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		construction traffic volume is expected. Junction capacity assessments at SRN junctions along the construction routes during AM and PM peak hours may also be required depending on the level of traffic demands, which shall be determiend through further consultation.		Importantly, the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** also sets out the hours of operations and restrictions of HGV deliveries to avoid the road network peak periods and thus reduce the impact on the SRN and local roads. The final CTMP will be subject to approval of the NCC in liaison with NH.
National Highways	Transport and access	We are content that the traffic to be generated during operation of the proposed solar park will be minimal at the SRN.	No	Noted.
National Highways	Transport and access	National Highways requires details of any proposed signage, both temporary and permanent, to be located on the SRN. If temporary traffic management signs are	No	Noted - If signage on the SRN is included in the final CTMP

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		to be installed on the A1, National Highways must review and approve the proposed signage. Therefore, full details, including the dimensions of the signs, must be submitted for approval. All signage must be designed in accordance with the Department for Transport's requirements, as outlined in the Traffic Signs Manual Chapter 8, and must also comply with the Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB).		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** prior approval will be sought from NH.
National Highways	Transport and access	The need for any Abnormal Loads and identified routes are not specified at this stage. We look forward to receiving the routing of any required abnormal loads within the transport assessment.	Yes	Figure 14.7: Abnormal Load Routes **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.7]** within ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** show the proposed routes for AIL movements and Appendix E of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** provides AIL route assessment reports by a

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				AIL transportation specialist.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	Hagg Lane is a registered Bridleway (NT/Egmanton/BW5) and also supports farm traffic for the operation of the three surrounding fields operated by JS Dakin Farms. Although the lane appears to transit from Moorhouse Road at the south to Westen Road at the North, the northern most stretch is non metalled and may only be accessed by farm vehicles and is blocked by a locked gate approximately 300m north of the properties. Hagg Lane is a none metalled road with a poor road surface.	No	Noted.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	Gypsy Lodge's domestic buildings closely border Moorhouse Road with buildings less than 2m from the roads edge in places. Fields to the south also belong to the lodge and are accessed off Moorhouse Road. We understand that the property dates from the early to mid-1800's. The buildings are approximately 380m from the closest boundary constraint of the development.	No	Vibration effects are assessed in ES chapter 12, Noise and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. No vibration effects from road traffic are predicted as long as there is no solid (e.g., concrete) connection between the road carriageway and the wall/foundation of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				building. It is understood, from discussion with the owner of this property at consultation events, that there is no such connection at Gypsy Lodge.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	The residents have great concern relating to the construction compound access that is presently planned on Moorhouse Road, serving one of the largest solar arrays of the development. We feel this access point will result in an increase of traffic and pose an avoidable loss of screening to the array from residents and rights of way users. This construction access also leads to additional issues	No	There will be an increase in traffic on the northern section of Moorhouse Road resulting from the site access. The access strategy has however been amended since PEIR and use of an internal haul road is proposed to remove HGVs from the road network so they do not pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. The Outline Construction Traffic Management

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out measures to reduce and control this impact, including the scheduling of deliveries and avoiding peak road network periods.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	The traffic on this narrow, rural road will dramatically increase due mainly to the construction access planned on Moorhouse Road as well as other construction compounds to the south. We do not feel we have enough detail relating to the direction of flow and intended use of this road and we feel that there is ambiguity within the descriptive documentation relating to this topic.	Yes	There will be an increase in traffic on the northern section of Moorhouse Road resulting from the site access. The access strategy has however been amended since PEIR and use of an internal haul road is proposed to remove HGVs from the road network so they do not pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. ES Chapter 14, Traffic &

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** provides details of the existing and proposed forecast traffic flows.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	At Phase 1 – Non-statutory consultation, we were largely unaware of the anticipated construction compound access now labelled Access 24, which is access to solar array DB032. Nor the means of utilising the existing barn access road which presently exists off Moorhouse Road. It would appear that this detail was available at the time in the GNR EIA Scoping Report 20231108. We can find no description of the nature of these anticipated construction compounds within the documentation, pertaining to their physical structure, size, height or quantity of workers utilising each compound. Therefore, it is difficult to judge their direct visual impact. Can you please indicate if this detail is available within your documentation, and provide an example of the anticipated characteristics of these compounds.	No	Details of the compound areas can be found in ES Chapter 5, Development Description **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	During various Stage 1 - In Person Consultation Events, several residents questioned access and traffic requirements and were told that access to this portion of the development would be undertaken from the Great North Road B1164 and that traffic would not be a problem on Moorhouse Road for this reason.	Yes	The access strategy for this area has been reconsidered since PEIR and use of an internal haul road is proposed (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse) to remove HGVs from the road network so they do not pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however use the northern section of Moorhouse Road, which has less properties.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	We also note that a change has occurred to the order limits, which now includes Ladywood Lane as a possible access road, and links the northernmost tip of the solar array known as DB032 with the Great North Road B1164. Previously, the closest access point to this cluster of arrays from Great North Road was	No	Ladywood Lane has been removed from the Order Limits. The access strategy for this area has been reconsidered since PEIR and use of an

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Wadnal Lane to the south. We can find no details pertaining to Ladywood Lanes inclusion or its use in any of the above-mentioned documentation. It does not seem to support the site compound 24, which is presently accessed off Moorhouse Road. Can you please clarify the intended purpose of Ladywood Lane		internal haul road is proposed (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse) to remove HGVs from the road network so they do not pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however use the northern section of Moorhouse Road.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	We would request that efforts to made to remove the requirement for Access Point 24 from Moorhouse Road which would reduce or remove other consequential concerns listed later in the document as per the following comments	No	Unfortunately, site access on Moorhouse Road is needed to facilitate the construction of the Development.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	It would seem access into the north of DB032 from Ladywood Lane could possibly be used to service DB032's construction compound rather than access point 24, particularly if the compound was relocated to the north, rather than the west of DB032. This would,	No	Access routes to the northern section of the Development have been explored and included consideration of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		significantly reduce the traffic coming north down Moorhouse Road (Link 11) keeping all construction traffic for this quadrant of development to the more appropriate Great North Road.		Ladywood Lane. The proposed use of Weston Road and the northern section of Moorhouse Road is considered the most favourable due to road widths, ability to introduce passing places, alignment, and fewer adjacent properties.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	We consider the proposal made above relating to the use of Ladywood Lane may provide better compliance to the principles set out in this section, utilising a single-track access directly off The Great North Road B1164 as access to DB032 in a similar manner to Wadnal Lane Entrance (Site Access 25). This would appear to serve the listed priorities better than using two unclassified roads (Weston Road and Moorhouse Road) and would further meet your bullet point priority listing of "Uses roads of appropriate width and alignment."	No	Access routes to the northern section of the Development have been explored and included consideration of Ladywood Lane and Wadnal Lane. The proposed use of Weston Road and the northern section of Moorhouse Road is considered the most favourable due to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				road widths, ability to introduce passing places, alignment, and fewer adjacent properties.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	Moorhouse road in its entirety, starting from North at Weston Road, Egmanton terminating South at Main Steet, Ossington varies in widths between 3.6m to 4.8m which barely supports the passing of two average passenger vehicles for much of its length. In places it has soft grass verges, bordered by drainage ditches, which are crucial to the drainage of the surrounding fields, particularly in The North in the area of Hagg Lane and Gypsy Lodge. The maintenance of these ditches is also crucial to prevent flooding of Gypsy Lodge which borders the road and where existing flooding is an issue.	Yes	The access strategy for the northern area has been reconsidered since PEIR and now proposes the use of an internal haul road (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse). This arrangement will remove HGVs from the road network so they do not pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however use the northern section of Moorhouse Road and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				new passing places are now proposed along this section. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing, roads to be used for construction will be subject to a condition survey and any remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	The maps relating to transport provide a great level of ambiguity relating to the access points, link roads, study area, survey locations, passing points with each point shown in isolation on its own map. For clarity – all of this information would have been more useful published on a single map	Yes	New Figures are now provided in appendices to ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and within Appendix A of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	None of the documentation submitted at this consultation stage provides enough clarity on the anticipated traffic provision of Moorhouse Road and the direction of travel to and from site access point 24. In Fact, the lack of passing points north of Hagg lane, the traffic survey undertaken only between Moorhouse and Ossington and the diagrams showing HGV access only from a southerly direction, infers that vehicular transit, will all be from the South and will terminate at Access 24.However, this is not officially stated.	Yes	The access strategy for this area has been reconsidered since PEIR and use of an internal haul road is proposed (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse) to remove HGVs from the road network so they do not pass through

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however use the northern section of Moorhouse Road to route to the B1164 via Weston Road and additional passing places are now included. Additional traffic surveys have also been undertaken to understand the baseline conditions and impact with construction traffic.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	The diagrams show that HGV direction is North bound into Access Point 24 (DB032). Indeed, this is true of all compounds off Moorhouse Road. Can we infer from these diagrams that all HGV traffic will enter the Access Point 24 from the south? Is traffic leaving the site exiting in the same direction?	Yes	The access strategy for this area has been reconsidered since PEIR and use of an internal haul road is proposed (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse) to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				remove HGVs from the road network so they do not pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however arrive and depart using the northern section of Moorhouse Road to route to/from the B1164 via Weston Road.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	The Parish Meeting Clerk has requested a copy of the "Construction Traffic Summary" specific to our village. Which appears to show all access to DB032 will be via the south of Link 11. However, given that Link 11 appears to be a through route on most of the documentation we seek clarity on the use of this route. To date the information, we have requested has not been received.	Yes	Our apologies if you fell that you have not received information that you had been expecting. The access proposals and traffic volumes have been constantly refined over the course of the Development and the access strategy for this area has been reconsidered since PEIR

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				and use of an internal haul road is proposed (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse) to remove HGVs from the road network so they do not pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however arrive and depart using the northern section of Moorhouse Road to route to/from the B1164 via Weston Road.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	No traffic survey has been carried out to the north of Moorhouse, so there is no data available relating to a true increase of traffic resulting from the development north of Moorhouse. An increase in traffic at the North end of Moorhouse Road onto Weston Road will invariably result in an impact to the villagers of	Yes	Additional traffic surveys have been conducted since PEIR. All traffic survey locations are shown on Figure 14.3: Traffic Survey Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Egmanton as this is one of the main access roads to the village.		**3]** with data summarised in ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. The raw traffic survey data is provided in Appendix C of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	Passing Places. North of Moorhouse village there are three such places. However, the northern-most passing place is south of Site access 24. There are no passing places planned north of Site Access 24. Why is this?	Yes	Additional passing places are now included at the northern end of Moorhouse Road and their location shown on Figure 14.5: Passing Place Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.5]** of the ES.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	The road north of compound 24 is ultimately a similar width (3.6m – 3.8m) as that which is provided with passing points to the south. Particularly in proximity to	Yes	Additional passing places are now included at the northern end of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Gypsy lodge, the soft grass verge borders field drainage ditches which are crucial for the prevention of flooding to Gypsy Lodge. The verges will not support the weight of a moderate passenger vehicle, let alone a fully laden HGV. It's imperative to maintain the integrity of the verges and in doing so, the integrity of the drainage infrastructure.		Moorhouse Road and their location shown on Figure 14.5: Passing Place Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.5]** of the ES. Issues associated with drainage ditches are noted.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	If traffic is to transit Moorhouse Road, appropriate passing places incorporating adequate infrastructure to support drainage must be considered	Yes	Additional passing places are now included at the northern end of Moorhouse Road and their location shown on Figure 14.5: Passing Place Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.5]** of the ES. Issues associated with drainage are noted.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	we would also request that where passing places are required in the vicinity of Gypsy Lodge, that consideration be made to placing then on the opposite side of the road. History of existing drainage indicates	Yes	The location of passing places has been informed by consideration of such

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		that where the drainage is piped, that these are frequently blocked by debris leading to flooding of Gypsey lodge		matters and also the availability of space.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	it is simply not possible to safely navigate these roads at the national limits. Where workers and delivery drivers, who are unfamiliar with the area will be undertaking work we feel that the developer should undertake additional measures to reduce speed and raise awareness. We would suggest that temporary construction signage showing reduced limits should be placed upon the route and speed awareness should also feature prominently in internal briefings and safety documentation on regular intervals	Yes	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2] sets** out that temporary signage will be located on the routes used for construction and in the vicinity of the site access to raise awareness to the presence of turning vehicles etc. All construction traffic will be expected to drive at speeds appropriate to the road and conditions. Where interaction with non-motorised users is more likely, construction traffic will be required to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				drive at reduced speeds. Reduction of speed limits for the general public is not currently proposed.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	It is worth noting Link 11, which is approximately 4 miles long, is a road of narrow width, poor state of repair in many places, with very poor visibility on several sections due to high banked fields, and blind bends. Similarly, there are physical characteristics of the roads surface as well as the noted blind bends such as a lack of camber, the roads propensity towards winter frosting and a lack of being on publicly gritted route. One particular bad bend within our region is the right-hand bend/intersection between Hagg Lane and Gypsy Lodge.	Yes	The access strategy for the northern area has been reconsidered since PEIR and now proposes the use of an internal haul road (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse). This arrangement will remove HGVs from the road network so they do not use the southern end of Moorhouse Road or pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however use the northern section of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Moorhouse Road and new passing places are now proposed along this section. Additional passing places are now included at the northern end of Moorhouse Road and their location shown on Figure 14.5: Passing Place Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.5]** of the ES
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	The "Low" sensitivity risk rating criteria in Table 14.6 which is listed as: "Very few nearby sensitive receptors. High standard of highway with separation of vulnerable users and can accommodate changes in traffic volume." This would seem to be at odds with the physical properties of the road. And I would urge this categorisation to be lifted to at least "Medium"	Yes	The link sensitivity has been reassessed and is now rated as 'High' in Table 14.12: Link Sensitivity Rating in ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	daily, equestrians utilise Hagg Lane Bridleway, transiting a circular route from Egmanton Village. This route does fall into the order limits and the use of	No	Bridleway 5 falls within the recreational study area and is assessed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Moorhouse Road (Link 11) as a transit path north of Hagg Lane will undoubtedly result in construction traffic coming into contact with horses. Our map shows the two Bridleways (marked in Purple) both intersecting Western Road and Hagg Lane. Indeed, Gypsy Lodge houses stable facilities permitting equestrian access directly onto Moorhouse Road.		with ES Chapter 18, Recreation **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**. Non-motorised users (including equestrians) are considered in the ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and measures are identified in Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** in areas with an increased likelihood of interaction.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	Sections of Moorhouse Road and Western Road are popular with both individual as well as groups of pedestrians accessing the various rights of way that intersect the road. Local Cycle clubs undertake time trials regularly in the summer months on Great North	Yes	Noted, with thanks. Non-motorised users are considered in the ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Road and Moorhouse Road has been used on two occasions for the Tour of Britain, the last being 2024.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and measures are identified in Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** in areas with an increased likelihood of interaction.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	It is hard to believe an increase of traffic to this magnitude will not be significant, especially as these roads provide access to many fields which will be retained for agricultural purposes and the constant farming seasons throughout the development.	No	ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** considers Moorhouse Road (Link ID 14) and Weston Road (Link ID 15) as having a 'High' and 'Medium' sensitivity rating. Table 14.22 summarises the impact effects and when assessed against using the methodology

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				outlined in the ES Chapter, Moorhouse Road is forecast to experience 'Moderate' effects on 'NMU delay' and 'NMU amenity'. These are then assessed as being not significant.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	In Volume 2, Chapter 14 - Traffic and Transport Tables 14.16 (and further tables onwards). It appears that whatever the proceeding columns list, the net effect is a "Negligible" outcome. Take Link 2 as an example in this table. All columns seem to suggest a very high rate. However, as per all of the link roads, many with much lower ratings across the board, a "Negligible" outcome is listed. Without the assessment criteria, this detail would seem to be baseless upon first review. We may have missed it but can you please reiterate what methods are being used to generate the end "Significance" value	Yes	The significance of effect column within the assessment tables have been revised and uses the methodology outlined at the beginning of the chapter and the revised senility of link ratings.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	We note the Link 11 appears to have been labelled as "Ossington Road" in most of the written documentation and tables. However, it appears on Volume 3, Figure 14.5 as Moorhouse Road. It would seem to stem from the rural method of physically signposting roads differently at either end to show their destination, which is prevalent in this area, notably within Moorhouse Village. This also results in ambiguity within electronic mapping, which again changes from map to map. At both the northern and southern terminations of Link 11 it is signposted as "Moorhouse Road" as the destination in both cases. Within Moorhouse village the same roads are signposted as Weston Road and Ossington Road again, as their destinations from the village perspective. why is this	Yes	Noted - for consistency, this link is now referred to as 'Moorhouse Road' in reports and Figures. We are unable to comment on the naming convention of signs used by the local highway authority.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	all of the tables Link 11 is simply listed as "Ossington Road" which appears twice within the table, both as Link 11 and Link 14.Many readers may be forgiven for not appreciating that Moorhouse Road appears to play a significant role in the transport routing within the development. And it is important for clarity that all the PEIR documents are reviewed. Presently there is great ambiguity relating to descriptions of both Ossington	Yes	Noted, with thanks and this is now reflected in the documents

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Road and Moorhouse Road and omissions within the documentation relating to this important link road. Can you please review and adjust the road naming so that it is consistent across all documents.		
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	We would request that efforts to made to remove the requirement for Access Point 24 from Moorhouse Road which would remove or greatly reduce the traffic on Moorhouse Road	No	Unfortunately, site access on Moorhouse Road is needed to facilitate the construction of the Development. The access strategy for the northern area has been reconsidered since PEIR and now proposes the use of an internal haul road (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse). This arrangement will remove HGVs from the road network so they do not use the southern end of Moorhouse Road or

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however use the northern section of Moorhouse Road and new passing places are now proposed along this section.
Egmanton Parish Meeting	Transport and access	We would request that efforts to made to remove the requirement for Access Point 24 from Moorhouse Road which would remove or greatly reduce the traffic noise on Moorhouse Road.	No	Unfortunately, site access on Moorhouse Road is needed to facilitate the construction of the Development. The access strategy for the northern area has been reconsidered since PEIR and now proposes the use of an internal haul road (from Ossington Road to the east of Ossington to north of Moorhouse). This arrangement will remove

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				HGVs from the road network so they do not use the southern end of Moorhouse Road or pass through Ossington and Moorhouse. Traffic will however use the northern section of Moorhouse Road and new passing places are now proposed along this section.
Weston Parish Council	Transport and access	Are the two bridges crossing the A1 designed to carry the proposed loads anticipated (accessed from Wadnal Lane and Ladywood Lane) from all the construction traffic without any strengthening works.	No	Wadnal Lane and Ladywood Lane no longer form part of the Order Limits and will not be used by construction traffic.
Weston Parish Council	Transport and access	There are two proposed access routes to the Solar Park within the Weston Parish boundaries, Wadnal Lane and Ladywood Lane. Both are very close to 60 mph bends. Consideration should be given to reducing the speeds around these two locations to allow	Yes	Wadnal Lane and Ladywood Lane no longer form part of the Order Limits and will not

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		construction vehicles to safely turn into and exit from the access roads. One access road has a bridleway and both have pedestrian access along some or all of the route. These footpaths are used on a regular basis throughout the year.		be used by construction traffic.
Weston Parish Council	Transport and access	Will there be adequate provision for Fire Service access to the areas around Weston in the event of a fire.	Yes	Access for fire services has been considered and provision will be made within the internal site layout. The Fire Service are a statutory consultee for the application and will their comments provided.
Weston Parish Council	Transport and access	Following the completion of the traffic survey produced as part of the planning application process by the traveller site and the recent three serious accidents on Great North Road, it is clear that an increase in traffic of any number raises the risk of an accident to drivers and pedestrians that cross at the junction of Wadnall Lane. We must have a temporary and possibly permanent speed reduction to 40mph between the village gateway points on Great North Road.	Yes	Wadnal Lane has been removed from the Order Limits and will not be used by construction traffic. Speed limit reductions at the village gateways are not currently proposed. Traffic speed data for

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				three locations along the B114 Great North Road at Weston is included in Appendix C of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** if the Parish Council wish to use this data and pursue discussion with the local highway authority on this matter.
Weston Parish Council	Transport and access	In the village with have the adult residential care home and many of the residents walk around the village, along the footpaths, Great North Road and to Hall Grain Cafe, along Wadnall Lane. What provisions and risk assessments will be in place to maintain and improve the provision of footpaths both during the construction works and after, paying particular attention to accessibility?	Yes	Wadnal Lane has been removed from the Order Limits and will not be used by construction traffic.
Canal & River Trust	Transport and access	The Trust previously advised that due to the distance of the red line boundary from our network we expect that impacts concerning traffic and access will be	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		limited to those of routing of any traffic over bridges that cross our network. We maintain that routing should seek to utilise adopted roads where possible with the avoidance of narrow bridges that could be damaged by large HGV use. We note that Table 14.1 of Chapter 14 responds that 'this suggested approach reflects the routing strategy adopted' and we request that the Trust is retained as a consultee so that the finalised CTMP, for inclusion within the draft DCO, maintains this approach.		
Canal & River Trust	Transport and access	We also highlighted that the River Trent is a freight waterway capable of handling freight traffic and suggested that options for alternative non-road based construction transport to and from the site, including use of the river, should be considered. We note that Table 14.1 of Chapter 14 responds that 'the Applicant is actively engaged in dialogue to explore all opportunities for non-road based transport, including the use of rivers and canals. Full details will be provided and considered within the ES but are not currently concluded to a level appropriate for this PEIR.' The Trust remains willing to engage and provide further advice on the delivery of a construction	Yes	Freight is being considered as a transportation option by the Applicant.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		transport strategy incorporating our assets, for final inclusion within the draft DCO.		
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Transport and access	The proposed construction traffic access routes within our parish are already requiring pothole repairs and pose an ongoing issue. Some of the outlined routes do already carry HGV status but the extra strain on the infrastructure and condition of these roads is only going to deteriorate with the additional usage.	No	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing, roads to be used for construction will be subject to a condition survey and any remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Kneesall, Kersall and Ompton Parish Council	Transport and access	We are also home to an equestrian centre and a horse training facility, with the unpredictable nature of such animals it is hoped that suitable risk assessments have been carried out. We also have a number of cyclists horse riders and pedestrians with and without children using our roads and footpaths.	Yes	Noted, with thank. Non-motorised users are considered in the ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and measures are identified in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** in areas with an increased likelihood of interaction.
Maplebeck Parish Council	Transport and access	The planned route for construction traffic to access the site around Maplebeck was inadequate for HGVs and there was insufficient detail on passing places and in particular the Hollows road would require more passing places, a new route into Brecks farm avoiding the village and a widening of the junction with Caunton road . It seemed odd there were no proposals for passing places at the end of the Caunton road.	Yes	The access strategy for the area near Maplebeck has been reconsidered since PEIR and now proposes the use of an internal haul road (from east of Maplebeck and traversing to the south).

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Concern was expressed that passing places might become lorry parking places with the potential volume of traffic.		This arrangement will remove HGVs from the road network so they do not use the Hollows.
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	Transport and access	There is potential for multiple solar parks to be under construction at the same time or at least be overlapping. This could have a disastrous effect on road safety, traffic delays and of course the wellbeing of our communities. The alternative to multiple developments taking place at the same time is of course that they occur sequentially with an undetermined gap. This means the local communities are affected adversely, not by the developers optimistically stated timeframes, but for several years. Will this be considered and taken fully into account?	No	Developments to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment are identified in ES chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment, Technical Appendix A2.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** . The cumulative effects of these developments are then assessed in the respective ES chapters.
Eakring Parish Council	Transport and access	The proposed construction traffic access route is completely unsuitable and dangerous. There is a deep drainage ditch on one side of the access road while on the opposite side are historic and species rich hedges marked on Sanderson's 1834 Map. The road from Caunton – Eakring is narrow while at the same time	Yes	Passing places are proposed along this section to ease two-way traffic flows of large vehicles passing. Figure 14.6: Personal Injury

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		being used by cyclists, joggers, horse riders and walkers. The risk of collision and accidents will be very high particularly as the road is predicted to carry an extra 250 vehicles /day of which 60 at least will be HGV's during the construction phase. Children of the parish attend Kneesall C of E Primary School. They travel in the mornings and evenings along part of the access route.		Collision Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.6]** presents the accident history for this section of road and does not identify any existing concerns that would be exacerbated by construction traffic. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** includes measures in areas where interaction with non-motorised users is more likely. It also sets out measures to reduce delay to other users, including deliveries being scheduled and not occurring during road

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				peak periods or during school drop off/pick up times.
Eakring Parish Council	Transport and access	15 new passing places are proposed from the junction of the A616 to Eakring,4.5 miles of which 9 are within 2 miles of Eakring, measured from the Kersall junction. While reducing some of the threats to road users the passing places will not eliminate the risks entirely as well as the fear and intimidation from an extra 250 large vehicles/day. The large increase in HGV traffic and the large number of passing places will cause unacceptable delays to road users and others in our parish.	No	The impact of Fear and Intimidation is assessed in ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** and using the methodology outlined in the chapter, is assessed as being 'Negligible'. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2)**[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** includes measures to reduce delay to other users, including deliveries being scheduled and not occurring during road peak periods or during

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				school drop off/pick up times.
Eakring Parish Council	Transport and access	The narrow bridge at Tug Bridge Farm is dangerous and currently suitable for only one vehicle to pass at a time. The condition of the road is poor and suffers from frequent flooding particularly the stretch from the Kersall Junction and below Eakring Field farm, opposite Penny Pasture LWS Eakring and Maplebeck Meadows SSSI.	No	Concern is noted. A review of the road safety record for this location is included in the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]** and does not identify concerns. Vehicles will continue to negotiate this location as current arrangements. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing, roads to be used for construction will be subject to a condition survey and any

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Transport and access	At the southern end of the proposed project, it appears that the preferred routes will take the majority of traffic through South Muskham and Little Carlton - See Map "Construction Traffic Routes and Site Access Points Figure A14.1.7. The two main routes through this Parish provide access to up to 18 of the 33 access points shown in the plan and no other area ·n this plan has such a dependency on routes to the proposed access points.	Yes	Solar arrays have now been removed from the Order Limits in this area. Notwithstanding, the construction route to the Development in the west still uses the A616 past Little Carlton. The A616 is a good standard road and is considered appropriate for use for construction traffic and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				follows the route choice hierarchy.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Transport and access	This, in addition to the already growing numbers of traffic during the day through these two villages thanks to sat-nav rat runs and diversions when major roads are closed, will be an unacceptable deterioration on the quality of life in this Parish. Already the road decay from the heavier\traffic using our roads and the increased vibration damage is apparent as is ignoring speed limits and safety for locals. The increased traffic will affect the quality of life in this area and to imply that lorry drivers will adhere to only the approved route is also a concern. The very large scale increase in HGV traffic will increase and cause delays to other road users, especially when the Abnormal Indivisible Loads are on our roads.	Yes	The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV deliveries will be paused when an 'abnormal incident' has occurred on the network, such as road closures on the A1. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing, roads to be used for construction will be subject to a condition survey and any remedial measures

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken. Compliance with the approved routes for HGV deliveries will be a contractual requirement, with penalties if breached. AIL deliveries will be programmed to occur when the least disruption will occur.
South Muskham and Little Carlton	Transport and access	There is only a pavement on one side of the road along the B6325, and along the A616. There are no pavements within the residential centres of the villages, where roads are narrow and in places single track.	Yes	Constructed related HGV traffic will only be permitted to use the routes set out in the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council		Recent work on the Al, which saw traffic diverted along the A616 due to the southbound carriageway of the Al being closed, led to HGVs and other vehicles cutting through the villages and becoming stuck. Residents are fearful of the increased traffic this development will bring and are fearful of the risk of collisions and intimidation large traffic brings.		Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** . This will be a contractual requirement. The CTMP also includes measures such as signage to advise of routes that are not permitted. The CTMP also outlines that HGV deliveries will be paused when an 'abnormal incident' has occurred on the network, such as road closures on the A1.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Transport and access	South Muskham and Little Carlton become a 'rat run' for traffic whenever the Al is closed. This leads to difficulties in exiting Crow Lane, the Lane that abuts where fields are listed as being included in the development. The min-roundabout at the junction of the B6325 and A616 is unfit for purpose as it is and	Yes	Solar arrays have now been removed from the Order Limits in this area. Notwithstanding, the Outline Construction Traffic Management

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		adding additional traffic anticipated during the construction phase will lead to a disaster.		Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** outlines that HGV deliveries will be paused when an 'abnormal incident' has occurred on the network, such as road closures on the A1.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Transport and access	As outlined above, there are only footpaths along the A616 and B6325. There are public footpaths that allow some connection into the surrounding countryside but there needs to be a safe, accessible route for pedestrians, equestrians and cyclists. A mitigation measure was put forward to include a bridlepath to connect Crow Lane through to Bathley, but this has not been included. It is noted that there are access proposals contained within the documentation which shows existing and suggested permissive routes for pedestrians, cyclists and equestrians. There is no information that we could easily find which outlines a timeline for the introduction of these routes. Given the impact that construction traffic would have on our communities it is vitally important that residents have a	No	Some routes will be diverted to attain new off-road routes to enhance the recreational amenity and safety of the network. All recreational routes, including bridleways, will be managed throughout construction to ensure the safety of users. 32 km of new route will be created within the Development, enhancing the overall connectivity

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		safe route to walk and the provision of accessible. routes should be prioritised.		of the area, particularly between neighbouring villages, and All diversions that will be in place throughout the operational phase will be in place prior to the closure of the original route. Additional permissive paths will be in place for the operational phase. This is secured through technical appendix 18.1, recreational route management plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.18.1]**.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Transport and access	As NCC are the Local Highway Authority (LHA) and also a 'host' local authority, we have agreed that they will provide a response on this chapter. Accordingly, NSDC have no specific comments to make	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Transport and access	NSDC have no specific comments on the Access Proposals figure but would again refer to NCC who we anticipate will comment on this plan and would also ask the Applicant to carefully consider the views of the local community in this regard.	Yes	Noted.
Natural England	Transport and access	It is identified that there will be an increase in frequency of traffic movements, therefore NE advise the impact of increased construction emissions from traffic should too be considered. Only Affected Road Networks within 200m of a designated site and causing a change of over 200 HGV or 1000 cars AADT (Average Annual Daily Trips) require further assessment. NE acknowledge that the traffic movements generated during construction are unlikely to exceed the screening thresholds, nonetheless consideration should be given to the potential impacts of increased construction emissions on the SSSI.	Yes	The effects of traffic emissions are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** with references to ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14**]
Carlton on Trent Parish Council (Appended to NSDC Response)	Transport and access	Being beside the A1, Carlton on Trent will clearly be used as an access route to the development site for construction traffic. This will mean prolonged periods of heavy traffic moving between the A1 and site access points, along country roads that are in poor condition. These roads are barely wide enough for two cars to	No	The roads used for construction have been informed by desk studies and site visits. In addition to passing places, measures are

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		pass, let alone larger construction traffic, meaning already damaged verges will be exacerbated. The combined developments will mean years of disturbance and will likely leave a lasting legacy of even more potholes around site entrance Points. The heavy traffic will leave weaknesses in the road in perpetuity unless the road is re-surfaced.		set in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** that seek to reduce disruption and better facilitate the movement of all road users. The roads and their forecast traffic volumes have then been assessed in ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** using recognised methodologies. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				construction works commencing roads to be used for construction, a condition survey will be undertaken and remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed. Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
North Muskham Parish Council	Interrelationships	This cumulative effect in particular, affects North Muskham due to its linear compression within a thin north to south parcel of land between the River Trent and the East Coast main line and A1. Unlike many rural villages, we have very little easy access available to the open countryside and currently that being only to	No	In the design changes following PEIR, solar PV areas to the immediate west of North Muskham have been removed, principally to avoid areas with a small risk of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the west of the village, i.e.: the proposed area to receive the GNR solar developments		flooding. This has the effect of reducing development activity close to North Muskham. Further recreation effects are assessed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 18 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Interrelationships	It is likely that cumulative impacts will have a significant effect on: a. The landscape of the area and loss of its traditonal rural form b. Certainly, in the construction stage and potentially for a number of years; traffic congestion and loss of easy access for residents be they in vehicles, buses or as pedestrians c. The enjoyment of the countryside and the loss or at least the degradation of its physical and psychological benefits d. Increased noise and vibration e. Visual dominance and loss of visual and audible tranquillity	No	Cumulative effects on landscape character with existing and proposed developments is provided in the Environmental Statement Chapter 7 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. Traffic and Transport is addressed in the Environmental Statement Chapter 14 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**, on recreational

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				resources in Chapter 18 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.18]** and on human health in Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**. The interrelationships between these topics has been taken into consideration within the Environmental Statement Chapter 19 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.19]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Interrelationships	The current rate of solar development in Newark and Sherwood is unprecedented for our region. The cumulative impact of multiple large-scale projects in such a small area could lead to significant environmental degradation and loss of agricultural land, overwhelming the district's capacity to manage and mitigate these changes effectively. The PC have received a considered and welcome response from Matt Lamb, Director of Planning & Growth NSDC, responding to their concerns regarding the cumulative impact of current solar proposals in	No	Cumulative effects of the Development together with other proposed schemes is assessed in the Environmental Statement, with schemes selected for inclusion in Chapter 2 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**, and assessments carried out in the relevant

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Newark and Sherwood. This confirms that NSDCs will consider potential cumulative impact at the appropriate stage of applications. The PC have asked that this be fully extended to the consultee stages of current and future NSIPs as well as locally determined proposals. The PC understand the point that a defined number/amount of solar and other developments is a difficult subject to address from a planning perspective. We do still however believe that there needs to be some direction on what levels are ultimately acceptable other than the grid capacity. This will allow people and groups across the district to make informed decisions as to whether to support or oppose any individual solar or other project based on the overall scale and cumulative impact.		technical chapters of the Environmental Statement.
North Muskham Parish Council	Interrelationships	We have asked that NSDC commit to compiling a comprehensive mapping resource across North Nottinghamshire (inc N&S and Bassetlaw) and Eastern Lincolnshire (inc West Lindsey, North and South Kesteven) of all significant developments. This should include existing and operational energy sites, all proposed energy schemes (DCOs and planning applications), all existing and proposed mineral sites,	No	Cumulative effects of the Development together with other proposed schemes is assessed in the ES, with schemes selected for inclusion in the Environmental Statement Chapter 2

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		all existing major land uses such as Newark Sugar Factory, proposed urban extensions and local plan applications. It is not until this can be visualised that the full extent can be understood. We would hope that this would then be made publicly available.		**[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**, and assessments carried out in the relevant technical chapters of the Environmental Statement. A map showing the schemes selected for inclusion in the cumulative assessment is included at the bottom of Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A2.1.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** . The specific comment was a request to Newark and Sherwood District Council rather than the applicant.
North Muskham	Interrelationships	The PC believe it is essential that decision makers at all levels need to have a proper overview of what is happening overall, rather than looking at schemes in	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment on

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council		relative isolation with perhaps only similar schemes immediately adjacent being considered. Without some form of co-ordinated control the Trent Valley risks being overwhelmed by solar installations and other projects, leading to irreversible environmental changes. The cumulative impact would fundamentally alter our environment, making it difficult to restore or mitigate the changes once they have occurred.		strategic policy and guidance.
North Muskham Parish Council	Interrelationships	Human Health Impact Assessment: ONS published 27/11/2023: "A million fewer people are gaining health benefits from nature since 2020 http://tinyurl.com/4zmbtmc8, estimating the financial and medical cost of post-covid reduction in accessing nature. It is therefore essential that this is considered in areas of the proposal. This also needs to be combined with the cumulative impact of additional solar outside of GNR and every expanding gravel extraction.	No	As detailed in Chapter 16: Miscellaneous Issues, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**, a Human Health Impact Assessment (HHIA) has been undertaken to consider key determinants to protect human health. HHIAs are designed to determine whether a proposal might improve

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				health inequalities or negatively affect people's health and wellbeing in its widest sense. The people who might be affected are different depending on the nature and magnitude of the potential effect; where effects are predicted, the affected population is described. The scope of the human health impact assessment is explained in section 16.4.5, of Chapter 16: Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**, and the Applicant has followed the guidance.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
North Muskham Parish Council	Electromagnetic Fields	Solar power plants give out electromagnetic radiation which may reduce life expectancy! This radiation doesn't come from the panels themselves, but rather the industrial equipment used to store the energy the panels produce. Even though exposure to low level electromagnetic field has been studied 'extensively' the effect of acres of solar panels all emitting low level radiation has not been studied in the long term and these panels will remain in situ for 40 years! Solar power plants produce electromagnetic radiation that can affect the health of nearby residents. These rays are not coming from the solar panels themselves, but from industrial equipment used for the farms. While their effects are minimal, they can cause vision problems and headaches. Severe migraine has been reported by residents currently living near solar farms. Other reported health risks associated with living near a solar farm are anaemia and behavioural issues. Children are especially susceptible to exposure to solar panels, as they are in their growth stage.	No	Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** of the Environmental Statement follows guidance from the Department for Energy Security and Net Zero regarding public and occupational exposure published by the International Commission on Non-Ionizing Radiation Protection (ICNIRP). The Applicant will comply with these guidance measures to ensure that the basic restrictions are not reached of exceeded.
North Muskham	BESS safety	Battery Energy Storage Systems are notoriously unsafe, liable to catch fire and require hundreds of gallons of water to extinguish. Run off from such a	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment and has addressed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council		BESS fire contains hazardous waste, as discussed above and can contaminate water courses.		BESS safety concerns within the Environmental Statement Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** and within the Fire Safety management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
North Muskham Parish Council	BESS safety	There needs to be a 'Battery Safety Management Plan' put in place with the developers, local council and emergency services.	No	In order to ensure that the final mitigation design properly responds to the actual design to be constructed, we are proposing a DCO requirement that the mitigation will be designed to match the final PV design. That mitigation will be designed in consultation with relevant parties, and

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				will be submitted for their approval prior to construction.
North Muskham Parish Council	BESS safety	Analysis shows that new 'higher wattage' solar panels are at increased risk of 'thermal runaway.' Thermal runaway can become more likely when solar panels are operated in outdoor areas, an accumulation of dust or leaves can stop and reverse the current. There are increasing fears of explosion in every area affected by Solar Farm development and the explosion risk in storage facilities is very real.	No	The risks associated with a potential fire in a battery unit is not a significant effect in accordance with the general methods for assessing significance in the Environmental Statement as set out in section 2.3.5 of Chapter 2 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**.
North Muskham Parish Council	Human health	Specifically, solar power plants can cause significant deterioration of residents mental and physical health and habitat degradation.	No	A Human Health Impact Assessment (HHIA) located in the Environmental Statement Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** has been undertaken to consider key detriments

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				to protect human health. The assessment is based on the approach of considering the Developments impacts and their interrelationships on residents and subsequent effects on health and wellbeing. There is no evidence is provided for this, and Chapter 16 assesses the potential for effects on health, and identifies no likely significant effects.
North Muskham Parish Council	Human health	Developers and government should absolutely ensure measures are put in place to monitor the health and wellbeing of residents. Any patients attending hospital, could easily be coded from postcodes that are affected by large scale solar industrialisation and conditions	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. A Human Health Impact Assessment (HHIA) located in the Environmental

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		could be reported and monitored over the forty year life of the projects.		Statement Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** has been undertaken to consider key detriments to protect human health. The assessment is based on the approach of considering the Developments impacts and their interrelationships on residents and subsequent effects on health and wellbeing. In general, where significant effects are assessed, it may be beneficial to propose monitoring of the effects, particularly where mitigation can be adapted to further

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				reduce the effects. This Chapter identifies no significant effects on health and wellbeing, and no monitoring is proposed.
North Muskham Parish Council	Human health	Special consideration with regard to health and wellbeing should be also given to all of the following areas:- a. Noise - particular during construction b. Routing - Construction and maintenance – avoiding villages and/or unsuitable roads c. Fly Tipping - This will likely increase given the large tracts of land without attendance d. Screening - This is crucial and must be meaningful and maintainable. e. Glint and Glare – Should be kept to a minimum in all areas. f. Maintenance and Enhancement of PROWs and Permissive Paths – This is extremely important and the joining up of routes would be of great benefit g. Enhancement of natural areas ie grassland, woods,	No	As detailed in ES Chapter 16: Miscellaneous Issues **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**, a Human Health Impact Assessment (HHIA) has been undertaken to consider key determinants to protect human health. HHIAs are designed to determine whether a proposal might improve health inequalities or negatively affect people's health and wellbeing in its widest

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		orchards h. Protection of wildlife		sense. This assessment is based on the approach of considering scheme impacts and their interrelationships on residents and subsequent effects on health and wellbeing. These topics are considered in Chapter 16 where they relate to assessment. Commentary on other topics is: • Routing is addressed in Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport, **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**. • Fly tipping is not expected to be a

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				significant issue, given that the Order limits will benefit from the same level of security (hedges, gates, etc.) as is currently in place, with the addition of further fences around Work no. 1 (solar PV) and Work numbers 4, 5, 6 and 7 (substations and BESS). • Protection of wildlife is addressed in Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Laxton and Moorhouse	Human health	Fields 82, 93, 109, 142 and 37 should be removed due adverse impact on community health and wellbeing. In addition, the removal of farming assets will also see	No	No suggestion of why development in these fields might lead to an

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Parish Council		farming disappear permanently from the community and the area, negatively impacting the unique historic antecedents of the locality and composition and wellbeing of the community. Mental health, particularly male suicide, is a significant aspect of concern for rural communities. Such losses from the countryside in the parish are likely to have a negative effect on health and wellbeing within the community and to those who visit to seek solace from its vistas.		adverse impact on community health and wellbeing was given in the response, and none is readily apparent from a review of these fields.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Materials	The Port Talbot works have not closed completely and it is understood that it will continue to mill steel slabs imported from overseas. It is hoped that the ES can enlighten further on steel sourcing so as to provide firmer assessments on the scale of imports from China and the implications for employment in the United Kingdom.	No	The Applicant expects the steel used for mounting solar PV structures to be manufactured in the UK in electrical 'arc' furnaces **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**. An alternative that the Applicant may consider is importing ready-made mounting structures from abroad. A worst-case basis for assessment purposes has been used

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				in each of the technical assessments set out in the Environmental Statement Chapters 7-19 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7-19]**, as appropriate.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Waste	The Applicant rules out any waste framework metal on page 39 of Chapter 16. This does not seem credible as it assumes that all the machining for the framework on-site creates no wasted metal in cutting to length. However this Applicant's assertion is contradicted in Appendix A05 (paragraph 144) where it confirms that there will be waste metals from the construction of the framework.	Yes	These figures have been reviewed, along with changes to the design parameters, and a revised commentary is provided in the Environmental Statement, Volume 2 Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**.
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Cable route	The PEIR states that they could be up to 30m. That may be necessary in some places. Certainly where the intended cables are medium voltage destined for the next substation these will be significant projects. It is not known how wide the trench running alongside the Beck in the Figure 18 will be. For the sake of	No	The Environmental Statement, Volume 2 Chapter 5 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]** states the width of the cable trench will vary,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		discussion, a width of 10m will be assumed. Depth will be conservatively assumed at 1m below ground level. This is informed by paragraph 68 of Chapter 5 which assumes cabling burial depth of 0.6m to 1.5m. The 3 phase cables will need to rest on top of, and be covered by thermal sand which is required to dissipate heat away. Then the trench will be back filled. The stretch of trenching required alongside the Beck here is approximately 254m long. This equates to something in the region of 2,000m3 of soil to be excavated near to the Beck, using heavy plant machinery. The approximate weight of that clay rich soil would be 3,200 tonnes. Added to that groundwork is further excavation.		depending on the number and voltage of cables at a given location and on their arrangement within the trench. The width of the working area and trench is expected to be a maximum of 30 m (up to a 12 m trench, plus 9 m working corridor on either side).
Norwell and Norwell Woodhouse Parish Council	Cable route	Applicant's staff have stated verbally that many will be 8 -10 metres wide, with presumably narrower trenches within the arrays.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	BESS safety	Construction of the containers.	No	As detailed in Chapter 5: Development Description, of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Table 5.9 outlines the design parameters for Battery Containers. For more information, please refer to this chapter.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	BESS safety	What safety systems will the BESS have. How will the BESS be shut down or monitored, internal suppression system, in the event of a sife. Method of dealing with a fire (extinguish or controlled burn). Will the BESS have deflagaration devices. Contamination levels of gases and vapour, how will it be controlled, vented	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment and has addressed BESS safety concerns within the Environmental Statement Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** and within the Fire Safety management Plan (FSMP) **[[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	BESS safety	BESS container sizes, spacings between each other. BESS heat output if involved in fire to justify spacings	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment and has addressed BESS safety concerns within the Environmental Statement Chapter 16

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.2.16] and within the Fire Safety management Plan (FSMP) **[[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]**.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	BESS safety	As part of the finer detail to be supplied it will be expected that this will be evidenced by recognised testing methods, relevant expert endorsement and / or CFD modelling.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	BESS safety	Any buildings on site are likely to require compliance with Approved Document B and may fall under the scope of the Regulatory Reform (Fire Safety) Order 2005.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	BESS safety	NFRS is aware that the 'industry' is moving from extinguishment for fire incidents involving BESS containers, to 'burn out' and protect. This is based on advice from industry leading experts.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	BESS safety	NFRS seeks to clarify that the relevant enforcing authority for the protection of the environment (for example Environment Agency / Environmental Health / UK Health Security Agency) should be consulted. The relevance being that if this approach is not approved	No	The draft DCO requirement relating to Fire Safety Management requires that the planning authority must

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		by that enforcing body, this may influence any subsequent Risk Management and Emergency Response Plan detailing the requisite safety provisions expected for the site.		consult with NFRS and the Environment Agency before determining an application for approval of the Battery FSMP.
Nottinghamshire Fire Authority	BESS safety	Whilst it (NFRS) does recognise burn out as a means to resolve an emergency of this type on site, it is not the role of the Fire Authority to authorise it.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Policy	The County Council is also jointly working with Nottingham City Council on a new Waste Local Plan which will, once adopted, replace both the saved policies of the Waste Local Plan and the Waste Core Strategy. The new Waste Local Plan is currently undergoing examination, with hearing sessions held in October 2024 and the Councils now consulting on main modifications to the Plan. The Plan is therefore at an advanced stage and should be given weight as a material consideration.	Yes	The Emerging Waste Local Plan has been discussed in the Planning Statement **[EN010162/APP/5.5]** and Chapter 6 'Planning Policy' of the Environmental Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Policy	Whilst most policies within the Waste Core Strategy will not be relevant to this Development Consent Order as the proposal is a non-waste application, Policies WCS2: Waste Awareness, prevention and re-use and WCS10: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites apply	Yes	The outlined policies have been discussed in the Planning Statement **[EN010162/APP/5.5]** and Chapter 6 'Planning

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		to non-waste development. Similar Policies, SP1: Waste Prevention and re-use and SP8: Safeguarding Waste Management Sites, are proposed in the emerging Waste Local Plan. We detail further below how these policies are relevant and should be considered in the promoters future Planning Supporting Statement.		Policy' of the Environmental Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Policy	As detailed in Volume 2, Chapter 10 – Ground Conditions, parts of the proposed development falls within the mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel and brick clay.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Minerals	Whilst there are no permitted or allocated mineral sites within the proposal, there are three sand and gravel quarries to the East of the site, with Cromwell Quarry the closest at 230 metres. The northern part of the proposal, labelled as Parcel 7, is also adjacent to the Egmanton Oil well sites which are permitted and monitored by the County Council as the Mineral Planning Authority. To consider the potential effects of the development on the mineral resource and sites, the promoter, as per the County Council's request, has produced a Minerals Resource Assessment (Technical Appendix A10.9).	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Minerals	The Minerals Resource Assessment notes how land parcels 1 – 6 and parcel 8 fall within the mineral safeguarding area for sand and gravel or brick clay	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Minerals	As per Policy SP7 of the Nottinghamshire Minerals Local Plan, clause 2, any non-mineral development in the safeguarding areas will have to demonstrate the mineral resource will not be needlessly sterilised. The promoter has detailed that this clause is met as the development is of temporary nature, with an estimated life span of 40 – 50 years, and will not permanently sterilise the resource which could be worked after the closure of the site.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Minerals	Providing that the development is of temporary nature and would be, or can be, removed, including associated infrastructure, following the sites closure, then the County Council agree this should not cause a sterilisation of the mineral resource.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Minerals	In relation to safeguarding existing and allocated sites within the Minerals Local Plan, the County Council agree with the conclusions of the Mineral Resource Assessment that due to the distance between the quarries of Cromwell, Besthorpe and Langford and the	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		proposal site, the development does not pose a serious hinderance to the sites.		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	the PEIR does not appear to have considered the adopted Waste Core Strategy, saved policies of the Waste Local nor the emerging Waste Local Plan in Chapter 6 –Planning Policy of Volume 2. Whilst not a waste proposal, the Waste Core Strategy contains two policies which are relevant to this development consent order: WCS2 and WCS10, with the new Waste Local Plan containing similar policies, SP1 and SP8 respectively.	Yes	The Emerging Waste Local Plan has been discussed in the Planning Statement **[EN010162/APP/5.5]** and Chapter 6 'Planning Policy' of the Environmental Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**. Additionally, Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** makes reference to these policies
Nottinghamshire County Council	Policy	Policies WSC10 and SP8 both seek to safeguard operational and permitted waste management facilities. There are no waste facilities within the proposal area, with the nearest facility, Dean Hall Anaerobic Digestion site, approximately 720m to the north of land parcel 2, near the Doncaster's Plantation. The County Council therefore do not consider there to be a safeguarding	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		issue, but this should be addressed in the Supporting Planning Statement.		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	In terms of WCS2 and SP1, both policies seek for all developments to be designed, constructed and operated to minimise the creation of waste and maximise the recycling and recovery of waste. These policies are aimed at managing waste higher up the waste hierarchy as possible and to avoid the disposal of materials.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	Chapter 16 – Miscellaneous Issues of Volume 2 includes a section on waste, where it is detailed that a Site Waste Management Plan will be agreed as part of the CEMP prior to construction, with a draft outline CEMP given in Technical Appendix A5.3.	No	The Applicant confirms this is correct.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Policy	Within the draft outline CEMP, it details that the waste hierarchy is embedded into the Construction Site Waste Management Plan, seeking to prevent waste and ensure sufficient separation of waste to maximise materials to be re-used and recycled. The application therefore seems to be in line with Policies WCS2 and SP1, the promoter should demonstrate this within the future Planning Supporting Statement.	No	The Applicant confirms this is correct.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	Paragraph 144 of Chapter 16 – Miscellaneous Issues of Volume 2 outlines that no significant quantities of waste are anticipated during the construction and operation phases.	No	The Applicant confirms this is correct.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	Section 16.7.2.3 then goes onto discuss the decommissioning phase, outlining that arising materials will be recycled where practicable, with it expected that almost entirely everything at this stage can be. This is under the assumption that in 2060 there will be a well-established solar PV recycling industry.	No	The Applicant confirms this is correct, though the expected decommissioning date for the Development is c. 2070, rather than c. 2060 as stated in PEIR chapter 16 section 16.7.2.3.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	However, whilst preferable that the panels are fully recycled, such an industry is not yet established, particularly at the scale that would be required for this scheme and others. Other solar NSIP schemes in the area, for example Gate Burton, considered the worse-case scenario that the panels would need to be disposed of.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. More information on decommissioning best practices is located within the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.6 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.6]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	The County Council believes such an approach should continue to be taken, with consideration given to whether additional disposal capacity requirements would be required with reference to the current capacity forecasts set out in the Nottinghamshire and Nottingham Waste Needs Assessment that accompanies the emerging Waste Local Plan. This would lead to potential understanding of capacity requirements, which the Council could consider in future Plans.	Yes	The Environmental Statement Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** includes consideration of whether additional disposal capacity would be required if the main waste streams at decommissioning were not recycled.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Interrelationships	Since this proposed development is one of many large solar farm developments in the area, all with a similar timescale, the cumulative impact of this proposal with other developments on waste capacity in Nottinghamshire, and neighbouring authorities, should be considered.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. The parameters of the cumulative effects assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** were agreed upon with Newark and Sherwood District Council. The methods used to select cumulative sites accords with PINS guidance, and uses a "zone of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				influence" for each topic. Figure 2.1A **[EN010162/APP/6.3.2.1]** and 2.1B **[EN010162/APP/6.3.2.2]** show the developments that have been identified to be taken forward to stage 3 and 4 of the cumulative assessment process **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. The table in Technical Appendix A2.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** sets out the reasoning for the selection or otherwise of individual schemes.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	Overall, in relation to minerals and waste, the County Council do not foresee any safeguarding issues, though for minerals this is dependent on all aspects of	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		the development being able to be removed to ensure the mineral resource is not permanently sterilised.		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Waste	Consideration also must be given to the policies within the adopted Waste Core Strategy and emerging Waste Local Plan by the promoter, as well as further consideration to the waste arisings at the decommissioning phase. In particular, how this may impact on waste capacity requirements that the Council will need to consider in future Plans.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Human health	The Public Health Team has reviewed Chapter 16 Miscellaneous Issues with respect to Human Health. The summary of scoping comments in Table 16.3 related to Human Health provided by UKHSA and OHID are noted. The response from the NCC Public Health response is in full compliance with the UKHSA and OHID consultee responses, and it appears that the applicant has addressed these comments. Therefore, currently, the Council has no further comments to add.	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	A number of high profile incidents have taken place and learning from these incidents continues to emerge.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	In the UK, approval for the majority of BESS installations takes place through the Local Authority planning process. Fire and Rescue Services (FRSs) may be engaged throughout the planning process, but this is not a statutory requirement. However, the National Fire Chiefs Council would encourage early engagement with the local FRS, continuing throughout the planning process.	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	The NFCC's expectation is that a comprehensive risk management process must be undertaken by operators to identify hazards and risks specific to the facility and develop, implement, maintain and review risk controls. From this process a robust Emergency Response Plan should be developed.	No	Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Given the rapidly developing nature of the technology, and ever evolving understanding of risks and mitigation measures, there is a need for guidance to support	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		FRSs in providing consistent and evidence-based contributions to the planning process.		
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	The guidance does not seek to provide a full specification or opinion on the entirety of a BESS system design. Instead, the aim is to limit the content to such matters that directly relate to facilitating a safe and effective response, by the fire and rescue service, to a fire or vapour cloud release involving a BESS installation. This includes factors such as facilities for the fire and rescue service, and design factors that contribute to reducing the escalation in the severity of an incident.	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	This guidance relates specifically to grid scale (typically 1 MW or larger) BESS in open air environments, using lithium-ion batteries.	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	This guidance has been developed with the safety of the public and emergency responders in mind. It is based on trying to help reduce the risk as far as reasonably practicable, whilst recognising that ultimate responsibility for the safe design and running of these facilities rests with the operator. The guidelines are a starting point and cannot cover every eventuality or type of design.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	In developing these guidelines the hazards and risks from lithium-ion batteries, identified in National Operational Guidance, has been considered.	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	The following principles should be considered by Fire Services, when liaising with owners and operators, and form the basis of this guidance: 1. Effective identification and management of hazards and risks specific to the siting, infrastructure, layout, and operations at the facility. 2. Impact on surrounding communities, buildings, and infrastructure. 3. Siting of renewable energy infrastructure so as to eliminate or reduce hazards to emergency responders. 4. Safe access for emergency responders in and around the facility, including to energy storage infrastructure and firefighting infrastructure. 1 State of Victoria (County Fire Authority) (2022), Design Guidelines and Model Requirements: Renewable Energy Facilities, p.4 Page 3 of 10 Version 1.0 November 2022 5. Provision of adequate water supply and firefighting infrastructure to allow safe and effective emergency response.	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		6. Vegetation sited and managed so as to avoid increased bushfire and grassfire risk. 7. Prevention of fire ignition on-site. 8. Prevention of fire spread between site infrastructure (solar panel banks, wind turbines, battery containers/enclosures). 9. Prevention of external fire impacting and igniting site infrastructure. 10.Provision of accurate and current information for emergency responders during emergencies. 11.Effective emergency planning and management, specific to the site, infrastructure and operations. 12.Owner to have a comprehensive Emergency Response Plan, showing full understanding of hazards, risks, and consequences		
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Grid scale BESS should form part of FRS planning in accordance with arrangements required under section 7(2)(d) of the Fire and Rescue Services Act (2004).	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Site Specific Risk Information (SSRI) should be made available to crews in the form of an effective Emergency Response Plan. Details of any site access arrangements, such as key codes, should be provided to the FRS.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				are set out in the ES Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Information is required as early as possible from the applicant /developer/designer/manufacturer etc., to allow an initial appraisal of the BESS to be made. This information should be provided to the FRS (via the Local Authority Planners in the first instance), with appropriate evidence provided to support any claims made on performance, and with appropriate standards cited for installation. Such information should also be made available to FRSs for inclusion in Site Specific Risk Information (SSRI) records	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Information required: 1. The battery chemistries being proposed (e.g. Lithium-ion Phosphate (LFP), Lithium Nickel Manganese Cobalt Oxide (NMC)). Because: a. Battery chemistries will directly affect the heat released when a cell goes into thermal runaway2	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		b. Battery chemistries will influence vapour cloud formation. c. An understanding of the battery chemistry is useful when requesting scientific advice during an incident 2. The battery form factor (e.g. cylindrical, pouch, prismatic) 3. Type of BESS e.g. container or cabinet 4. Number of BESS containers/cabinets 5. Size/capacity of each BESS unit (typically in MWh) 6. How the BESS units will be laid out relative to one another. 7. A diagram / plan of the site. 8. Evidence that site geography has been taken into account (e.g. prevailing wind conditions). 9. Access to, and within, the site for FRS assets 10.Details of any fire-resisting design features 11.Details of any: a. Fire suppression systems b. On site water supplies (e.g. hydrants, EWS etc) c. Smoke or fire detection systems (including how these are communicated) d. Gas and/or specific electrolyte vapour detection systems		Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		e. Temperature management systems f. Ventilation systems g. Exhaust systems h. Deflagration venting systems 12.Identification of any surrounding communities, sites, and infrastructure that may be impacted as a result of an incident.		
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Details of any evidence based testing of the system design should be requested, for example, results of UL 9540A testing.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Design features should be made clear of the BESS.	No	Features of the BESS are located within the Environmental

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Statement Chapter 5 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.5]**.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	An effective and appropriate method of early detection of a fault within the batteries should be in place, with immediate disconnection of the affected battery/batteries. This may be achieved automatically through the provision of an effective Battery Management System (BMS) and/or a specific electrolyte vapour detection system. Should thermal runaway conditions be detected then there should be the facility in place for the early alerting of emergency services. Detection systems should also be in place for alerting to other fires that do not involve thermal runaway Continuous combustible gas monitoring within units should be provided. Gas detectors should alarm at the presence of flammable gas (yes/no), shut down the ESS, and cause the switchover to full exhaust of the ventilation system3. Sensor location should be appropriate for the type of gas detected e.g. hydrogen, carbon monoxide, volatile organic compounds External audible and visual warning devices (such as	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		cabinet level strobing lights), as well as addressable identification at control and indicating equipment, should be to linked to: 1. Battery Management System (when a thermal runaway event is identified) 2. Detection and suppression system activation This will enable first responders to understand what the warning is in relation to. This will aid in their decision-making. Suitable fixed suppression systems should be installed in units in order to help prevent or limit propagation between modules. Where it is suggested that suppression systems are not required in the design, this choice should be supported by an evidence based justification and Emergency Response Plan that is designed with this approach in mind (for example, risk assessed controlled burn strategies, and external sprinkler systems).		
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Whilst gaseous suppression systems have been proposed previously, current research indicates the installation of water based suppression systems for fires involving cell modules is more effective. The	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		installation of gaseous suppression systems for electrical fires that do not involve cell modules may be appropriate but should be built into a wider suppression strategy. FM Global cite the following reasons for not recommending gaseous protection systems4: 1. Efficacy relative to the hazard. 2.Cooling. 3.Limited Discharge.		
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	The choice of a suppression system should be informed by liaison with a competent system designer who can relate the system choice to the risk identified and the duration of its required activation. Such a choice must be evidence based. Any calculations for sufficient water supply for an appropriate suppression system will need to be completed by a competent person considering the appropriate risk and duration of any fire.	No	The Applicant will ensure that a full and final Fire Safety Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** will be developed, based on the Outline FSPM, and agreed with Newark and Sherwood Council in consultation with Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service prior to the start of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				construction of the Work no.5a.
National Fire Chiefs Council	Bess safety	BESS containers should be fitted with deflagration venting and explosion protection appropriate to the hazard. Designs should be developed by competent persons, with design suitability able to be evidenced.6 Exhaust systems designed to prevent deflagration should keep the environment below 25% of Lower Explosive Limit (LEL). Flames and materials discharged as a result of any venting should be directed outside to a safe location and should not contribute to any further fire propagation beyond the unit involved or present further risk to persons. The likely path of any vented gasses or materials should be identified in Emergency Response Plans to reduce risk to responders. Explosion/deflagration strategies should be built into the emergency plan such that responders are aware of their presence and the impact of their actions on these strategies. Where emergency ventilation is used to mitigate an explosion hazard, the disconnect for the ventilation system should be clearly marked to notify personnel or first responders to not disconnect the	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		power supply to the ventilation system during an evolving incident. In the event of a fire involving a BESS unit, one of the primary tactics employed will be to prevent further unit to unit fire spread. Suitable access for firefighters to operate unimpeded between units will therefore be required. This should allow for the laying and movement of hoselines and, as such, access should be free of restrictions and obstacles. The presence of High Voltage DC Electrical Systems is a risk and their location should be identified. Exclusion zones should be identified.		
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	A standard minimum spacing between units of 6 metres is suggested9 unless suitable design features can be introduced to reduce that spacing. If reducing distances a clear, evidence based, case for the reduction should be shown. Any reduction in this separation distance should be design based by a competent fire engineer. There should be consideration for the fire separation internally and the total realistic load of fire. Proposed distances should be based on radiant heat flux (output) as an ignition source.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	The NFCC does not support the stacking of containers/units on top of one another on the basis of the level of risk in relation to fire loading, potential fire spread, and restrictions on access.	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Individual site designs will mean that distances between BESS units and occupied buildings/site boundaries will vary. Proposed distances should take into account risk and mitigation factors. an initial minimum distance of 25 metres is proposed prior to any mitigation such as blast walls. Reduction of distances may be possible in areas of lower risk (e.g. rural settings). Where possible buildings should be located upwind. Sites should be maintained in order that, in the event of fire, the risk of propagation between units is reduced. This will include ensuring that combustibles are not stored adjacent to units and access is clear and maintained.	No	Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Areas within 10 metres of BESS units should be cleared of combustible vegetation and any other vegetation on site should be kept in a condition such that they do not increase the risk of fire on site. Areas with wildfire risk or vegetation that would result in significant size fires should be factored into this	No	Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		assessment and additional cleared distances maintained as required.		Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Proposals for water supplies on site should be developed following liaison with the local fire and rescue service taking into account the likely flow rates required to achieve tactical priorities. This should also take account of the ability of/anticipated time for the fire and rescue service to bring larger volumes of water to site (for example through the provision of High Volume Pumps)	No	The Applicant will ensure that a full and final Fire Safety Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** will be developed, based on the Outline FSPM, and agreed with Newark and Sherwood Council in consultation with Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service prior to the start of construction of the Work no.5a.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	IP ratings of units should be known so that risks associated with boundary cooling can be understood. As a minimum, it is recommended that hydrant	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Details of the fire risk

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		supplies for boundary cooling purposes should be located close to BESS containers (but considering safe access in the event of a fire) and should be capable of delivering no less than 1,900 litres per minute for at least 2 hours. Fire and rescue services may wish to increase this requirement dependant on location and their ability to bring supplementary supplies to site in a timely fashion. Water supply for any automatic suppression system will be covered by the relevant standard/design depending on which system chosen as appropriate for the risk. For manual water, amounts should come from performance based requirement rather than a reference to a code, unless it can be proven that the code specifically covers BESS. Regarding water storage tanks, volumes will again need to be informed on a performance-based need. Isolation points should be identified		reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Any static water storage tanks designed to be used for firefighting must be located at least 10 metres away from any BESS container/cabinet. They must be clearly marked with appropriate signage. They must be easily accessible to FRS vehicles and their siting should be considered as part of a risk assessed	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		approach that considers potential fire development/impacts. Outlets and connections should be agreed with the local FRS. Any outlets and hard suction points should be protected from mechanical damage (e.g. through use of bollards).		Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Signage should be installed in a suitable and visible location on the outside of BESS units identifying the presence of a BESS system. Signage should also include details of: - Relevant hazards posed - The type of technology associated with the BESS - Any suppression system fitted - 24/7 Emergency Contact Information Signs on the exterior of a building or enclosure should be sized such that at least one sign is legible at night at a distance of 30 metres or from the site boundary, whichever is closer	No	Noted.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Adherence to the Dangerous Substances (Notification and Marking of Sites) Regulations 1990 (NAMOS) should be considered where the total quantity of dangerous substances exceeded 25 tonnes	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	Site operators should develop emergency plans and share these with the Fire and Rescue Service.	No	The Applicant will ensure that a full and final Fire Safety Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** will be developed, based on the Outline FSPM, and agreed with Newark and Sherwood Council in consultation with Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service prior to the start of construction of the Work no.5a.
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	A Risk Management Plan should be developed by the operator, which provides advice in relation to potential emergency response implications including: - The hazards and risks at and to the facility and their proposed management. - Any safety issues for firefighters responding to emergencies at the facility. - Safe access to and within the facility for emergency	No	The Applicant will ensure that a full and final Fire Safety Management Plan **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** will be developed, based on the Outline FSPM, and agreed with Newark

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		vehicles and responders, including to key site infrastructure and fire protection systems. - The adequacy of proposed fire detection and suppression systems (eg., water supply) on-site. - Natural and built infrastructure and on-site processes that may impact or delay effective emergency response. An Emergency Response Plan should be developed to facilitate effective and safe emergency response and should include: - How the fire service will be alerted - A facility description, including infrastructure details, operations, number of personnel, and operating hours. - A site plan depicting key infrastructure: site access points and internal roads; firefighting facilities (water tanks, pumps, booster systems, fire hydrants, fire hose reels etc); drainage; and neighbouring properties. Details of emergency resources, including fire detection and suppression systems and equipment; gas detection; emergency eye-wash and shower facilities; spill containment systems and equipment; emergency warning systems; communication systems; personal protective equipment; first aid.		and Sherwood Council in consultation with Nottinghamshire Fire and Rescue Service prior to the start of construction of the Work no.5a.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		- Up-to-date contact details for facility personnel, and any relevant off-site personnel that could provide technical support during an emergency. - A list of dangerous goods stored on site. - Site evacuation procedures. - Emergency procedures for all credible hazards and risks, including building, infrastructure and vehicle fire, grassfire and bushfire		
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	System capability/capacity should be based on anticipated water application rates, including the impact of water based fixed suppression systems.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
National Fire Chiefs Council	BESS safety	The operator should develop a post-incident recovery plan that addresses the potential for reignition of ESS and de-energizing the system, as well as removal and disposal of damaged equipment	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Details of the fire risk reduction and management measures are set out in the Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A5.4, Fire Safety Management Plan (FSMP) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.4]** .
West Lindsey District Council	Interrelationships	Given the substantial scale of the proposed development it is pertinent to consider the cumulative impact of the development on the wider area. Chapter 2 Section 2.3.8 of the Preliminary Environmental Information Report follows a 4 Stage approach in assessing the potential cumulative impact of the development in accordance with PINS advice note 17. It should be noted that West Lindsey currently has a number of NSIP proposals within the District at differing stages. These include the Gate Burton Energy	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. The parameters of the cumulative effects assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]** were agreed upon with Newark and Sherwood District Council. The methods used to select

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Park, Cottam Solar Project, West Burton Solar Project and the Tillbridge Solar Project, three of which are now consented, and one remaining at examination.		cumulative sites accords with PINS guidance and uses a "zone of influence" for each topic. Figure 2.1A **[EN010162/APP/6.3.2.1]** and 2.1B **[EN010162/APP/6.3.2.2]** show the developments that have been identified to be taken forward to stage 3 and 4 of the cumulative assessment process **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. The table in Technical Appendix A2.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** sets out the reasoning for the selection or otherwise of individual schemes.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
West Lindsey District Council	Interrelationships	The DCO for One Earth Solar Farm (ref: EN010159) which is presently at the preapplication stage, located partially within West Lindsey, is noted within appendix A2.1. The project is a large cross boundary scheme and as noted in prior consultation with WLDC has been noted to present potential harm to the rural character of the district and Lincolnshire as a whole. Further discussion and cumulative consideration should be given to EN010159 and the other proposals within the district.	No	The Applicant assessed the cumulative effects of other developments within a "zone of influence" for each topic, as set out by PINS guidance. The Environmental Statement Technical Appendix A2.1.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** shows that the One Earth Solar Farm is selected for inclusion in cumulative effects assessments as appropriate.
Health and Safety Executive	Safety	Based on Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park documents and PEIR, it is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemicals that are proposed to be present at the development. This may be because there are no relevant hazardous substances. Hazard classification	No	The Applicant acknowledges this comment. There is not expected to be a requirement for a

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		is relevant to the potential for accidents. For example, hazardous substances planning consent is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on, over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. There is an addition rule in the Schedule for below threshold substances. If hazardous substances planning consent is required, please consult the relevant Hazardous Substance Authority (usually the Local Planning Authority) on the application.		Hazardous Substances Consent.
Health and Safety Executive	Safety	Regulation 5(4) of the Infrastructure Planning (Environmental Impact Assessment) Regulations 2017 requires the assessment of significant effects to include, where relevant, the expected significant effects arising from the proposed development's vulnerability to major accidents	No	The Scoping Report prepared by the Applicant in November 2023 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.3.1]** identified a list of potential major accidents or disasters that could affect the Development or potentially be cause

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				or influenced by the Development. Further information on major accidents is located in the Environmental Statement Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**.
Health and Safety Executive	Safety	In the PEIR it was not clear if there was consideration of risk assessments arising from the development's vulnerability to major accidents. We would advise this is considered further in line with Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website - Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive taking account of the following: "it may be beneficial for applicants to undertake a risk assessment as early as possible to satisfy themselves that their design and operation will meet the requirements of relevant health and safety legislation as design of the Proposed Development progresses". Note, that there are no requirements for any risk assessments submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority to also be considered by HSE.	No	The Development will not (with current legislation) be required to have a permit under the COMAH regulations. The Development will therefore meet the requirement of health and safety legislation in respect of major accidents caused by the Development itself. Potential risks to the Development from accidents external to the Development have been

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				considered in Environmental Statement Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** section 16.5.
Health and Safety Executive	Safety	Explosives Inspectorate has no comment to make as there are no HSE licenced explosives sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.	No	Noted.
Averham, Kelham & Staythorpe Parish Council	Safety	The real and perceived impact of the health and safety of BESS sites and the loss of rural landscape cannot be underestimated.	No	Effects on landscape fabric and character are fully considered in the LVIA, located in the Environmental Statement Chapter 7 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. The safety of the proposed BESS is fully considered in the Environmental Statement Chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]**, section 16.5.1.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Eakring Parish Council	Interrelationships	The Parish of Eakring hosts both a wind and a solar farm. Immediately adjacent to the parish boundary is an additional solar farm. The cumulative impact on the village and the surrounding area of the proposed GNR Solar Farm, other NSIP solar projects proposed for the area together with planned and existing solar farms under 50 MW in Newark and Sherwood is unacceptable and is and will create an industrialised landscape for generations to come. As a Parish Council we object to the size, location and cumulative impact of the GNR Solar Park. As residents of the parish with local knowledge we wish to see improvements to the current proposals for Eakring	No	Developments to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment are identified in Environmental Statement Chapter 2, Environmental Impact Assessment **[EN010162/APP/6.2.2]**. The methods used to select cumulative sites accords with PINS guidance and uses a "zone of influence" for each topic. Figure 2.1A **[EN010162/APP/6.3.2.1]** and 2.1B **[EN010162/APP/6.3.2.2]** show the developments that have been identified to be taken forward to stage 3 and 4 of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				cumulative assessment process **[EN010162/APP/6.2.7]**. The table in Technical Appendix A2.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** sets out the reasoning for the selection or otherwise of individual schemes.
South Muskham and Little Carlton Parish Council	Interrelationships	In general, the cumulative effect of this and many similar installations and proposals (and other large scale nearby projects) will transform and destroy the fabric, ecology and heritage of this area.	No	Developments to be considered in the cumulative effects assessment are identified in Environmental Statement Chapter 2 [**EN010162/APP/6.2.2**], Technical Appendix A2.1 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.2.1]** . The cumulative effects of these developments are then assessed in the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				respective Environmental Statement chapters.
Environment Agency	Contamination	The potential contamination associated with the former RAF Ossington does not mention radium. Radium coatings were often used in aeroplane dials and occasionally, planes were buried on old RAF sites - so radium is a contaminant of concern. Inadequate assessment of potential contaminants at the site could lead to risks to groundwater not being identified. Include radium as a contaminant of concern for any site characterisation assessments of the former RAF Ossington within parcel 7.	Yes	The conceptual site model for Study Area (Land Parcel) 7 has been amended to include Radium as a potential source of contamination and is included in a revised version of TA A10.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.10.7]**.
Environment Agency	Contamination	The Environment Agency is not listed as being notified under the 'discovery strategy protocol,' Possible risks to controlled waters could be overlooked. We request the Environment Agency is also included as part of this process, should contamination be identified.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment.
Environment Agency	Contamination	We disagree with the conceptual site model presented and request further assessment, Inadequate assessment of potential source-pathway-receptors linkages could lead to risks to groundwater not being	Yes	The conceptual site model for Study Area (Land Parcel) 7 has been amended for

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		identified. Reconsider the conceptual site model for land parcel 7 and the need for additional land contamination assessment. Groundwater has been disregarded as potential receptor, despite Land Parcel 7 overlying a Secondary A aquifer. A Source of pollution within Land Parcel 7 is the former RAF site located within the boundary. These receptors and sources should be included in the conceptual site model.		inclusion in a revised version of TA A10.7 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.10.7]**.
Environment Agency	Policy	The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 has not been included in the list of legislation that is relevant to biodiversity. The legal responsibility on the developer pertaining to this fish specific legislation has not been considered. This infers the impacts on fish from the construction, operation and decommissioning have not been fully considered. This legislation should be listed and considered in the biodiversity chapter of the Environmental Statement (ES) and submitted as part of the Development Consent Order (DCO). Parts of The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 relevant to this type of development and that should be considered, are (but not exhaustive) Part 1, Sections 2 and 4.	Yes	The Salmon and Freshwater Fisheries Act 1975 is now included in the list of legislation in section 8.3 of ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]** of the Environmental Statement. Effects to fish are assessed in ES Chapter 8, Ecology and Biodiversity of the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Environmental Statement.
Environment Agency	Contamination	Contaminated soil that is (or must be) disposed of is waste. Therefore, its handling, transport, treatment, and disposal are subject to waste management legislation, which includes:• Duty of Care Regulations 1991 • Hazardous Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2005 • Environmental Permitting (England and Wales) Regulations 2016 • The Waste (England and Wales) Regulations 2011 Developers should ensure that all contaminated materials are adequately characterised both chemically and physically in line with British Standard BS EN 14899:2005 'Characterization of Waste - Sampling of Waste Materials - Framework for the Preparation and Application of a Sampling Plan' and that the permitting status of any proposed treatment or disposal activity is clear. If in doubt, the Environment Agency should be contacted for advice at an early stage to avoid any delays. If you receive (or reject) any hazardous waste, you must send a report to the Environment Agency. These are known as 'returns.' If you dispose of hazardous waste at the premises where it's produced,	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		you may also need to send returns. You should follow the guidance provided here: Hazardous waste: consignee returns guidance The Environmental Protection (Duty of Care) Regulations 1991 for dealing with waste materials are applicable to any off-site movements of wastes. The code of practice applies to you if you produce, carry, keep, dispose of, treat, import, or have control of waste in England or Wales. The law requires anyone dealing with waste to keep it safe and make sure it's dealt with responsibly and only given to businesses authorised to take it.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Policy	Paragraph 6.4.1.2 refers to the NPPF having been most recently updated in December 2023, but a more substantive update was made in December 2024. The next stage of work should ensure the latest version of the NPFF is referred to. Further to this, Paragraph 6.4.1.3 (under the heading of Local Planning Policy) refers to the fact that local planning policy is a relevant material consideration stating that 'District and county planning policy, comprising adopted and relevant emerging Development Plans, will continue to be taken into account at all relevant stages in the DCO process.' NSDC agree in relation to the importance to be	No	The revised NPPF has been discussed in the Planning Statement **[EN010162/APP/5.5]** and ES Chapter 6, Planning Policy of the Environmental Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**. In respect of 'taken into account,' the main policy

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		afforded to the development plan, but it is not clear what 'taken into account' equates to. The paragraph refers to a draft of the planning statement having already been prepared, but it would appear that this does not form part of the consultation materials made available as part of the Applicant's statutory consultation. NSDC would expect that the applicant produces a planning statement at submission stage that includes for an assessment against all relevant policies within the development plan. Whilst NSDC agree that there is no explicit legal requirement to determine applications in accordance with the development plan, we would refer to Section 104 (2) (b) which requires the SoS to have regard to the Local Impact Report (LIR) in making a decision. Further to this the Planning Inspectorate also encourage local authorities to include (amongst other issues) within an LIR2'An appraisal of the project's compliance with all relevant local planning policy and guidance.' As such a LIR should include the relevant local planning policy context in accordance with this guidance and it routinely does, for the significant		considerations for a DCO submission are the National Policy Statements. That being said, any local policies have also been considered, informed the Development and discussed throughout the submission.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		majority of LIR's that are prepared. In this regard, the local planning policy context will feature in the issues considered by the decision maker and should therefore continue to be afforded weight in the context of the proposed development by the Applicant.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Policy	It is also noted that brief reference is made to the Second Publication Amended Allocations and Development Management Development Plan Document (2023) (ADMDPD) at paragraph 6.7.2. Although it does not currently form part of the adopted development plan, the ADMDPD is at an advanced stage of preparation and is currently subject to an Examination in Public (EIP). Given the programme of the project, NSDC consider that the ADMDPD is likely to be increasingly relevant as part of the policy context and should be captured within the Applicant's Planning Statement	No	The outlined policy document has been discussed in the Planning Statement **[EN010162/APP/5.5]** and ES Chapter 6, Planning Policy **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Policy	In respect of paragraph 6.6.1 (Amended Core Strategy) we would recommend the following policy also be considered, as it is not currently identified: Core Policy 6 - Shaping our Employment Profile. In addition to the above, and further to paragraph 6.6.2, we would recommend that the following policy from the	No	The outlined policy has been discussed in the Planning Statement **[EN010162/APP/5.5]** and ES Chapter 6

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		ADMDPD also be considered:DM10 – Pollution and Hazardous Substances.		Planning Policy **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Policy	Further to adopted policies, and linked into the point made above, NSDC consider that the following policies of the ADMDPD should be considered within the assessment of the scheme. • Policy DM3- Developer Contributions and Planning Obligations. • Policy DM4 - Renewable and Low Carbon Energy Generation. 2 Nationally Significant Infrastructure Projects: Advice for Local Authorities - GOV.UK • Policy DM5(a) - The Design Process. • Policy DM5(b) – Design. • Policy DM5(c) - Sequential Test. • Policy DM7 - Biodiversity and Green Infrastructure. • Policy DM8 - Development in the Open Countryside. • Policy DM9 - Protecting and Enhancing the Historic Environment. • Policy DM10 - Pollution and Hazardous Materials. • Policy DM12 Presumption in Favour of Sustainable Development.	No	The outlined policies have been discussed in the Planning Statement **[EN010162/APP/5.5]** and ES Chapter 6, Planning Policy **[EN010162/APP/6.2.6]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Contamination	In respect of Chapter 10, NSDC have focussed our review on the Desk Study and Preliminary Risk Assessment reports for land parcels 1-8 completed by RPS on behalf of the Applicant. These provide a broad, high-level assessment of land contamination risks relating to the development site and proposed solar park use.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Contamination	The assessment concludes that the majority of land parcels present low risk in terms of land contamination and require no further assessment. The exception to this is Debdale Tip in Parcel 4 which the report states require further consideration and a phase 2 intrusive investigation and ground gas assessment.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Contamination	Whilst we concur with the output of the assessment work at this stage, it would be helpful for the applicant to confirm when the Phase 2 work would be undertaken, also noting that requirement no. 16 within the DCO seeks to provide for further assessment work, where the risk is higher than 'low.'	No	Post PEIR submission design changes have resulted in exclusion of the Debdale Tip location from the proposed construction areas. This would avoid disturbance of contents or creation of additional potential gas migration pathways. The

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				contamination risk presented by this feature has been re-evaluated and reassessed as low risk in TA A10.4 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.10.4]**.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Contamination	It is noted that UXO presents medium and high risks in several locations across the development site (Parcel 2 Averham Park decoy bombing site, Parcel's 7 and 8 former RAF Ossington). Again, it would be useful for the applicant to confirm when further assessment work will be undertaken to address this high-level risk, again noting draft requirement no. 16. Any controls and mitigation necessary should consider how site workers would be protected from such risk, including nearby communities during the construction stage of development (should permission be forthcoming).	No	A Detailed Stage 2 UXO Desk Study has been undertaken and provided as TA A10.10 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.10.10]** in Chapter 10 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.10]**. Recommended control and mitigation measures to reduce the risk posed by UXO to As Low as Reasonably Practicable (ALARP) are included.
Newark & Sherwood	Human Health	NSDC note that Human Health is captured within Chapter 16, from Paragraph 16.4 onwards and in particular note some of the previous concerns that	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
District Council		have been raised by Carlton on Trent Parish Council (summarised in Table 16.3) relating to the potential impacts on mental health. It would appear that the main response to this issue, is the Mental Well Being Impact Assessment Screening (November 2024) which is presented as Technical Appendix A16.2.		
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Human Health	Whilst accepting that the document is a screening toolkit, some of the responses are quite limited, with regard to predicting the likely impact, as are the comments correcommendations, with a reliance being placed upon a stock response of 'Opportunities have been consulted on and enhanced as far as practicable.' The response above offers little in the way of meaning on how likely impacts have been understood and considered and any constraints to implementing further measures that may emerge from the more detailed consideration of potential impacts.	Yes	The screening has been reviewed following PEIR, for this ES. A revised version is included in the ES TA A16.2 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.16.2]**. The Order Limits principally comprise private land, and public access to that land will generally not change with the Development (although there will be more access in places, via the proposed

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				permissive paths). The principal effects on the public are as set out in this ES, i.e., local visual and noise effects, construction effects principally on traffic, benefits to ecology, recreation, employment and climate and a reversible loss of agricultural land. As a result, there is generally no mechanism for the Development to affect the factors set out in the toolkit, which relate generally to affecting some categories or groups of people differently to others. The exceptions are the proposed additional

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				recreational routes and the community orchard.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Human Health	The comments on likely impacts for 'Individual' are more limited, with little acknowledgement on the potential negative impacts on emotional well being for example. Finally, the consideration of community impacts appears to be overly reliant on reference to the annual community fund of £1m, as a general response as a means to mitigate all community related impacts, rather than consideration a more bespoke set of recommendations. The community fund is in any event a proposal and is not something that can be secured/maintained as part of the DCO, should permission be forthcoming.	No	Section 16.4.4 of the ES chapter 16 **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16]** summarises the methodology, as specified by Pyper, R., et al. 2022, which is the methodology recommended by the UKHSE and OHID. This sets out that assessment of significance at the level of individuals is not proportionate, and that EIA should take a population health approach. The assessment results are based on the Development as will be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				subject to the DCO only, and not the annual community fund. However, the community fund is relevant in this context, and so is referred to.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Electromagnetic Fields	Finally, NSDC have no comments to make at this stage on Electromagnetic Fields and have agreed with NCC that they will respond on Major Accidents or disasters.	No	Noted.
Newark & Sherwood District Council	Interrelationships	NSDC have no specific comments to make on this chapter.	No	Noted.

2 SECTION 42 TARGETED CONSULTATION APPLICANT RESPONSE TABLE

Table 2: Section 42 Targeted Consultation Applicant Response Table

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Transport and Access	We further note that all of these changes are as a result of transport and access requirements, with Areas 1 and 2 being proposed to remove the need for construction traffic to pass through the villages of Ossington, Moorhouse and Weston. Whilst we broadly welcome these additions, on the understanding that they have been designed in response to local community concerns, we would revert to Nottinghamshire County Council as Highway Authority, for their responses on these issues.	No	Noted.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	In relation to potential biodiversity impacts, Area 1 includes Moorhouse Road and Western Road, where localised widening is proposed to create passing places. The associated ecological impact involves the permanent loss of small sections of grassland along the road verges.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	Weston Road includes an existing crossing over the Grassthope Beck. The forthcoming ES chapter and accompanying technical appendices will need to detail any mitigation required and it is considered that a small length will need to be scoped into the BNG assessment to assess impacts on the riparian zone that may arise from the proposed passing place located to the south.	No	The BNG Assessment (TA A8.13 **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.13]**) includes consideration of watercourse crossings. The Order Limits at this location include only the adopted highway and the passing place is approximately 20 m at its closest point from the beck.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Egmanton Parish disagrees with the proposal to utilise the new Moorhouse Road / Weston Road link for the following reasons: An unacceptable increase in construction traffic which will principally affect the residents of Partridge Farm, Hagg Lane residents and on a wider scope, the Village of Egmanton.	Yes	Construction traffic will not pass through the village of Egmanton. It is however acknowledged that residents of Partridge Farm and Hagg Lane will experience an increase in construction traffic. Increase in traffic levels during construction is an unfortunate consequence of

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Developments and measures are included in the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** to reduce this impact. Traffic impact, is assessed in ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport Chapter **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Egmanton Parish Meeting requests that all efforts are made for providing alternative access into the northern quadrant of the development to remove or reduce the inclusion of the north end of Moorhouse Road and Weston Road to a tolerable level.	No	Alternative access arrangements to the northern area of the Development have been considered and the access strategy presented is considered the most appropriate. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2] sets out measures to reduce the impact. ES Chapter 14, Traffic and Transport Chapter **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** classifies Moorhouse Road and Weston Road as 'High' sensitivity and 'Medium' sensitivity respectively and assesses the impact from traffic accordingly.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	We do not consider that removing two existing access routes, included at stage 1 and stage 2, which is intended to alleviate disruption to two separate residential properties, and then placing the burden on a third residential property (Partridge Farm) is an appropriate, or fair process. We do not wish to see our neighbouring villages residents suffer either, which is why we have provided some additional mitigation for you	Yes	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Alternative access arrangements to the northern area of the Development have been considered and the access strategy presented is considered the most appropriate. The Outline Construction Traffic

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		to consider, further detailed in the sections below which should reduce or alleviate increases in traffic to all three properties. Whilst maintaining the overall goal of reducing traffic through Moorhouse, Weston, Ossington and Egmanton.		Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** sets out measures to reduce the impact.
Egmanton Parish Council	General	To be clear – Our original stage two response sought to clarify the requirement for our section of Moorhouse Road to be utilised at all. Any mitigation suggestions that were made, were made with the understanding that "some" traffic would inevitably end up transiting northwards on Moorhouse Road towards Weston Road. Our mitigations were never proposed to deal with a daily planned transit of this nature and quantity.	No	Noted.
Egmanton Parish Council	Noise and Vibration	Egmanton parish considers that Partridge Farm in particular will be directly affected by the noise and vibration that will occur from the increase in HGV traffic, being so close to the road (within 2m of the road surface).	No	Potential noise effects, including on receptors within the Study Area close to Egmanton, are assessed in ES Chapter 12, Noise

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		This building has no fixed foundation, and is already at risk from flooding due to the degradation of the dykes at either side of the road. We see no mitigation of any means provided by the developer to reduce the direct impact on this property, nor have they commented on any of the mitigation measures suggested within our original phase two response to date.		and Vibration **[EN010162/APP/6.2.12]**. Numerous Mitigation measures to control noise and vibration during construction phase are presented in the oCEMP (Technical Appendix A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**) provides details of mitigation which can be implemented minimise noise and vibration during construction activities. In addition, the delivery route will be maintained and improved before, during and after the construction period, ensuring vibration from traffic will be

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				minimised as far as practicable.
Egmanton Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	The narrative relating to the proposed change is limited to a "Leaflet" of several paragraphs and a change of details on a simple map. There is simply not enough detail available to make an informed decision relating to the impact on affected residents, and this only raises additional concerns.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Following receipt of Egmanton Parish Council's feedback to Targeted Consultation, the Applicant contacted the parish council to acknowledge their feedback, along with a reminder to the parish councils that the Applicant remains on hand to be contacted via the Development communications channels should they have any further questions.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Council	Consultation and Engagement	The developer states that these changes are "minor" and relate to concerns of congestion at Moorhouse, Ossington and Weston, but fails to address all concerns, queries, and suggestions made by Egmanton residents within the phase two consultation, and directly opposes statements made at phase one "In person events" by officials of Elements Green to our residents.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Applicant responses to comments received from Egmanton Parish Council are captured in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	The developer has published no traffic survey information upon which to base any assumptions of present traffic numbers on either Moorhouse Road north of Moorhouse village nor Weston Road.	Yes	Traffic surveys have been undertaken on Moorhouse Road north of Moorhouse village and on Weston Road. Survey locations are shown on Figure 14.3: Traffic Survey Locations **[EN010162/APP/6.3.14.3]** with data summarised in ES Chapter 14, Traffic & Transport **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				The raw traffic survey data is provided in Appendix C of the Transport Statement (TA A14.1) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.14.1]**.
Egmanton Parish Council	General	Any changes of this nature would require a radical modification of PEIR Chapter 14 - Traffic and Transport, as the proposed changes introduce new, un-surveyed sections of roads and will dramatically alter the proposals and assumptions made within the document. The PEIR document contained numerous errors as it was initially published for phase two, it is our opinion that this document should be resubmitted for public consultation before submission of the DCO by the developer.	No	As part of the Applicant's Development Consent Order (DCO) application, the Traffic and Transport Chapter of the Environmental Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** has been updated following both Phase Two Consultation and the Applicant's subsequent Targeted Consultation.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Council	Decommissioning and Construction	Within our original phase two consultation response, we placed much emphasis on the importance of the quantity, location and construction of any passing points, especially in relation to placement around Partridge farm as any structures inevitably lead to backing up of the dykes. Past history shows any pipework placed within these dykes requires constant maintenance to ensure they are kept clear from debris and in good working order. We have received no justification for the quantity and placement of these passing points within this proposal, or how any such structures will be maintained throughout the project's lifecycle and who will maintain them.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Applicant responses to comments received from Egmanton Parish Council are captured in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Having visited Ladywood Lane we can see that there are two residential properties on the lane, however only one of these is within a reasonable distance to the lane, the other is set back and heavily obscured by mature trees bordering the lane. It is difficult to	Yes	Alternative access arrangements to the northern area of the Development have been considered and the access strategy presented is

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		understand why this lane was proposed for phase 2 and then subsequently rejected, given that the residential amenity on this road is not dissimilar to that of Partridge Farm.		considered the most appropriate, meaning use of Ladywood Lane no-longer being proposed for a number of reasons, including its width, alignment and being the route of a formal Public Footpath.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Given we had no narrative of Ladywood Lanes inclusion, we can only assume that this lane was proposed to service the development of solar array listed as DB032, which sits separated from the other arrays to the south by Moorhouse Beck. We initially supported this additional access as it met our understanding of all access via the south or east, reducing or removing traffic from the north end of Moorhouse Road.	Yes	Alternative access arrangements to the northern area of the Development have been considered and the access strategy presented is considered the most appropriate, meaning use of Ladywood Lane no-longer being proposed for a number of reasons, including its width, alignment and being the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				route of a formal Public Footpath.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Egmanton Parish Meeting has no opposition to entry into DB034 via site access 24 within the operational phase with the expectations of low attendance, given our experience of maintenance regime of Egmanton Solar Farm.	No	Noted.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Hagg Lane is a registered Bridleway (NT/Egmanton/BW5) and also supports farm traffic for the operation of the three surrounding fields operated by JS Dakin Farms. Although the lane appears to transit from Moorhouse Road at the south to Westen Road at the North, the northern most stretch is non metalled and may only be accessed by farm vehicles and is blocked by a locked gate approximately 300m north of the properties. Hagg Lane is a none metalled road with a poor road surface. The closest domestic building is	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		approximately 350m to the boundary constraints		
Tuxford Town Council	Transport and Access	We note the change in HGV routes to this site, which have not been proactively identified to us. Our comments relate to the proposed changes in Area 1 and 2, which do not cover the area which would be unacceptably negatively impacted.	No	Noted.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Recreation	In particular, we would request that (if this has not been done already) that the Area 2 change which includes a public right of way diversion, is discussed further with the Rights of Way Officer at Nottinghamshire County Council and any community comments on this proposed change is carefully considered as part of this targeted additional consultation being undertaken.	Yes	The Area 2 change has been further discussed between the Rights of Way Officer at Nottinghamshire County Council and the Applicant. Engagement throughout the design process aimed at agreeing acceptable approaches in instances where PRoW interact with the Development, to ensure that appropriate mitigation,

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				including diversions are in place to safeguard users
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	Area 2, encompassing Ossington Lane, will also feature passing places and a new access point, resulting in the loss of small areas of verge habitat. In addition to the loss of grassland there should be consideration of any management requirements of the adjacent field hedgerow boundaries to facilitate the passing places, such as a reduction in width. From a review of aerial imagery Area 2 will utilise and existing access gap in the hedgerow network but may require additional widening. Any direct or indirect impacts will need to be accounted for as part of the Biodiversity Net Gain (BNG) Assessment.	No	No works are proposed to the hedgerows to facilitate the passing places. Retained hedgerows and trees will be protected during works by the methods set out in the oCEMP (TA A5.3 of the ES **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.3]**).
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Our suggestion is, given the capital expenditure that will be made on this project it should not be unfeasible for access to be made into array DB032 from the alternate entrances of Wadnal Lane, Ossington Lane	No	The cable crossing the Moorhouse beck at this location will use Horizontal Directional Drilling so to limit the environmental

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		or a combination, over a temporary structure bridging the Beck. Therefore, removing the need for any heavy traffic utilising site access 24. Given that the beck will likely be bridged anyway for cabling requirements this does not seem improbable. Our mitigation makes assumptions based upon the limited availability of a specific plan for access and making a great deal of effort to understand the technical rationale behind the decisions that are being made by the developer.		impact on the beck - A temporary bridge structure in this area is not proposed and will not be available for construction traffic.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Wadnal Lane appears to serve direct entry to DB033 and DB034 at the south side of Moorhouse beck, we expected that access would also continue onto the other arrays in this area, lessening the need for existing road access through Moorhouse.	Yes	Access to the land south of the beck is now proposed to be accessed from Ossington Lane using internal routing.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Although Wadnal Lane does have a single residential dwelling, the lane already services a large industrial unit, which also houses a retail outlet. A further large agricultural barn and hardstanding presently houses several HGV trailers adjacent to the proposed solar arrays on the west of the A1. Heavy vehicles transiting this road should not be uncommon.	Yes	One of the considerations for removing Wadnal Lane was its current use by HGVs and therefore increased likelihood of two HGVs passing along this narrow road, which is also a Public Footpath.
Egmanton Parish Council	Transport and Access	Egmanton Parish Meeting originally had no comment to Wadnal Road entrance route into the site, as it met the requirements of accessing the site from the largest roads first. B1164 being the largest road included within the scheme and already handles heavy road traffic from multiple industrial premises in Tuxford, Weston and Sutton on Trent with no apparent detriment to any of the villages on this route.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Egmanton Parish Council	General	Egmanton Parish Meeting supports the inclusion of Ossington Lane into the scheme. The lane does not provide any traffic past residential properties within the proposed route, the closest residences appear to be two small holdings each with alternative access through other roads, and in any case, each are beyond the affected route so will not see any noise or vibration.	No	Noted.
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and Access	Councillors feel the identified additional access routes at both 1 and 2, but particularly 2, are not suitable roads for such traffic.	Yes	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Alternative access arrangements to the northern area of the Development have been considered and the access strategy presented is considered the most appropriate. The Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				sets out measures to reduce the impact.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Compulsory Purchase	Finally, whilst noting that the Area 3 change comprises a smaller area of land, it would be useful if the Applicant could clarify whether this supplementary land is likely to be secured via agreement, or whether compulsory purchase is deemed necessary (including the justification for this).	No	The Applicant has established that it does not need development consent for any works for the purposes of using the wharf at Staythorpe Power Station to transport and unload construction equipment and material via the river. This land has therefore been removed from the Order Limits. The Applicant is in advanced discussions with RWE for a commercial agreement to use the wharf for these purposes

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Transport and Access	Area 3 appears to comprise part of an existing access track and small area of grassland.	No	Noted.
Egmanton Parish Council	General	Egmanton Parish Meeting does not have any comments relating to this proposal. This area of land has no effect upon our principal concerns of increased traffic within our area during the development phase.	No	Noted.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and Access	The County Council notes that the proposed order limits of the project have been extended to include two additional sections of highway to the north of the project which are intended to be used for construction traffic, to avoid routing traffic through the villages of Ossington, Moorhouse and Weston, in light of feedback received during the Phase Two Statutory Consultation. It is noted that the reason for including these sections of highway within the order limits is to allow the developer to undertake	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		widening to create additional passing places.		
Nottinghamshire County Council	Transport and Access	The County Council in its capacity as the Local Highway Authority is satisfied with the proposed additions to the order limits in principle, subject to the transport assessment being updated to consider the impact of the revised access strategy on the wider highway network. It is noted that the Targeted Consultation Information Leaflet includes a summary of the traffic impacts but this should be presented in detail through the final version of the Environmental Statement which is submitted with the application.	No	Noted. As part of the Applicant's Development Consent Order (DCO) application, the Traffic and Transport Chapter of the Environmental Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.2.14]** has been updated following both Phase Two Consultation and the Applicant's subsequent Targeted Consultation.
Nottinghamshire County Council	Consultation and Engagement	It is not clear from the consultation materials whether any engagement has taken place with the affected communities beyond the distribution of the Targeted Consultation Information Leaflet. The County Council would advocate further community engagement about these amendments prior	No	As detailed in Chapter 11 of the Consultation Report: Targeted Consultation on a series of proposed boundary changes, **[EN010162/APP/5.1]**, the Applicant publicised the

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		to submission of the application and would recommend that Elements Green provides an opportunity to meet with the affected parish councils (Egmanton Parish Council, Weston Parish Council and Sutton-on-Trent Parish Council) to apprise them of the implications and receive any verbal feedback, prior to submitting the application for examination. This would ensure continuity of approach with the Statement of Community Consultation that was prepared in advance of the Phase Two Statutory Consultation (February 2025) and ensure compliance with Section 47 of the Planning Act 2008.		consultation information by distributing a targeted consultation information leaflet to over 1,500 properties within the parish boundaries of Weston, Egmanton, Laxton and Moorhouse, Norwell, Ossington, Sutton-on-Trent and Carlton-on-Trent; distributed a press release containing details of the consultation to regional media publications; providing the relevant consultation information documents on the Development website; and contacted identified stakeholders and individuals who had registered to be kept

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				informed. The Applicant also consulted with Section 42 consultees and the relevant persons defined under Section 44 of the 2008 Act as part of this Targeted Consultation. Appendix 5.1.7: Section 42 Consultation Materials **[EN010162/APP/5.1.7]** includes a list of the Section 42 consultees for the Development, and Appendix 5.1.9: Targeted Consultation **[EN010162/APP/5.1.9]** includes a list of the land interests consulted. The Applicant notes Nottinghamshire County Council's comments

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				regarding engagement with the three host parish councils. Egmanton Parish Meeting and Sutton-on-Trent Parish Council both provided responses to this phase of targeted consultation. With this in mind, the Applicant contacted both parishes to acknowledge their feedback, along with a reminder to the parishes that the Applicant remains on hand to be contacted via the Development communications channels should they have any further questions. In addition to this, and noting that Weston Parish Council has not responded to this

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				phase of targeted consultation, the Applicant contacted the parish council to confirm whether they have any questions on 11 June 2025.
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	Due to the loss of habitat, we would expect that the additional areas will be surveyed as part of the baseline habitat assessment and associated condition assessments within the optimal survey months (April-September). None of the additional areas fall within a statutory or non-statutory designated sites.	No	Habitats have been surveyed during the optimal period and incorporated into the baseline reported in TA A8.2 Habitats and Vegetation Baseline **[EN010162/APP/6.4.8.2]**
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	It is not anticipated that the proposals would have any additional effects on protected and notable species, however based on the habitats present within these areas the potential impacts on riparian mammals, breeding birds and reptiles will need to be accounted for within the ES chapter and Technical Appendices.	No	Noted. This has been accounted for in the Ecology and Biodiversity Chapter of the Environmental Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Newark and Sherwood District Council	Ecology and Biodiversity	The inclusion of the additional Order Limit areas is not anticipated to result in any likely significant effect to ecological receptors but should be adequately reported within the forthcoming ES Chapter.	No	Noted. This has been accounted for in the Ecology and Biodiversity Chapter of the Environmental Statement **[EN010162/APP/6.2.8]**.
Health and Safety Executive	General	Based on the project's May 2025 targeted consultation documents and PEIR, it is not clear whether the applicant has considered the hazard classification of any chemicals that are proposed to be present at the development. This may be because there are no relevant hazardous substances. Hazard classification is relevant to the potential for accidents. For example, hazardous substances planning consent is required to store or use any of the Categories of Substances or Named Hazardous Substances set out in Schedule 1 of The Planning (Hazardous Substances) Regulations 2015 as amended, if those hazardous substances will be present on,	No	Neither a hazardous substance consent, nor a hazardous substance planning consent will be required. Details of the consultation with HSE on the topic of hazardous substances and accident risk are found at Ch 16 Miscellaneous issues, Waste **[EN010162/APP/6.2.16.5.1]**

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		over or under the land at or above the controlled quantities. There is an addition rule in the Schedule for below threshold substances. If hazardous substances planning consent is required, please consult the relevant Hazardous Substance Authority (usually the Local Planning Authority) on the application.		
Health and Safety Executive	General	According to HSE's records, the proposed DCO application boundary for this Nationally Significant Infrastructure Project is not within the consultation zones of any major accident hazard sites or major accident hazard pipelines. This is based on the scheme boundary 'redline' in drawing 'Figure 1 - Overview map - May 2025' downloaded from 'Targeted consultation documents' https://www.gnrsolarpark.co.uk/documents which is a section of the Targeted Consultation Information Leaflet (and verified by the DCO boundary GIS file 'order_limits_Dec24_additional_land_v2.shp	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		' within "Additional Land PIER Order Limits.zip" received by email on 22/05/2025).		
Historic England	General	We note the suite of documentation included, as well as the amendments made to the order limits. We note the limited and small scale additional land required to fulfil access and transport requirements.	No	Noted.
NGET	Protective Provisions	The Targeted Consultation Area 2 includes the addition of Ossington Lane. This will add an additional interaction of the order limits with the NGET assets: ZDA 400 kV OHL, Cottam- Grendon, Cottam- Staythorpe 2. I would be interested in having a meeting to provide NGET the opportunity to understand the project further. If you can also provide solicitors details, we can send these over to DLA (Ian Graves: ian.graves@dlapiper.cominstructed), NGETs	No	Some protective provisions have been provided for the benefit of electricity undertakers in the draft development consent order and the Applicant will progress discussions with NGET to consider the requirement for further tailored provisions.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		instructed solicitors on this matter, who can provide draft protective provisions. Where the Promoter intends to acquire land, extinguish rights, or interfere with or work within close proximity to any of NGET's apparatus and land, this will require appropriate protection and further discussion on the impact to its apparatus and rights. NGET assets form an essential part of the electricity transmission network in England and Wales. Please continue to consult NGET in regards to this development. NGET will require an adequate form of Protective Provisions included within the Order. If rights are required over NGET land, please use the following Developer guidance note available at: https://www.nationalgrid.com/electricity-transmission/use-of-national-grid-land to follow our process. to acquire rights to install		

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		new assets or undertake works on National Grid Electricity Transmission's (NGET) land. Our land agent BNP PRE will assist in the process and provide additional information.		
Egmanton Parish Council	General	Egmanton Parish meeting is open to direct discussions relating to these matters and we urge the developers to continue to liaise with the parish to reach an acceptable outcome to the development for all parties.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment and welcomes the opportunity to meet with Egmanton Parish Council. Following receipt of Egmanton Parish Council's feedback to Targeted Consultation, the Applicant contacted the parish council to acknowledge their feedback, along with a reminder to the parish councils that the Applicant remains on hand to be contacted via the Development communications channels

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				should they have any further questions.
Egmanton Parish Council	Landscape and Visual	Our comments refer to the areas comprising "Land Parcel 7" as defined in Volume 3 - Figure 10.1. This is the area of the development that borders Egmanton Parish. With DB032 being the closest array to Egmanton residents. However, from a visual perspective the other arrays within this land parcel also present a possible visual impact upon the residents, Notably DB031.	No	The effects of these distant views of solar panels would not be significant. Minor reductions in the panel area to the south made for other reasons would slightly reduce effects, mainly by bringing mitigation planting further upslope.
Tuxford Town Council	Transport and Access	Tuxford village centre already suffers from heavy HGV use, to the extent that the 18th century centre is often completely blocked. We are therefore concerned that- depending on origin - HGV traffic for this project would pass though the centre of Tuxford to gain access to the southbound B1164. This is not acceptable. However, if your HGV traffic plan includes the following, this would ensure no additional HGV traffic went	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		though Tuxford Town centre, and we would then be able to support it.		
Tuxford Town Council	Transport and Access	HGVs heading south on the A1 leave at the junction to the south of Tuxford, turn right and continue south on the B1164 to the access route to site. HGVs heading north on the A1 do not take the 6075 into Tuxford but continue north to the Markham Moor interchange, exiting to A1 and then turning south to the A1/B1164 junction identified above HGV's heading west from Lincoln along the A57 do not take the A6075 junction into Tuxford but continue on the A57 to the Markham Moor interchange, where they head south on the A1, leaving at the A1/B1164 junction south of Tuxford, as above.	No	The scope of HGV routing within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** is limited to the study area. However, the Council's comments and suggestion seems sensible and would benefit Tuxford and a recommendation will be made to the appointed Contractor to adopt this routing suggestion.
Tuxford Town Council	Transport and Access	HGV traffic from the west should as much as possible avoid the A6075, as this junction with the northern heading B1164 is already the most obstructed and the left turn (to avoid the centre) is tight and difficult for	No	The scope of HGV routing within the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2)

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		HGVs, particularly long ones. This would not cause significant delays to the HGVs - as passage though Tuxford Town centre from northbound is often subject to significant delays as the village centre consists of narrow streets which are blocked by two-way HGV traffic.		**[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** is limited to the study area. However, the Council's comments and suggestion seems sensible and would benefit Tuxford and a recommendation will be made to the appointed Contractor to adopt this routing suggestion.
Tuxford Town Council	Transport and Access	Likewise, transit down Newcastle Street to reach Egmanton along that route is also unacceptable as this is essentially not used by HGVs today and the road is narrow and unsuitable for any significant HGV traffic, both withing Tuxford and on the route to Egmanton. However, with this in place, we would support the project.	Yes	Newcastle Street does not form part of the proposed HGV routing for construction traffic and HGV construction traffic will not pass through the village of Egmanton.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Carlton on Trent Parish Council	Transport and Access	Despite the identification of passing points, in reality, traffic will pass in other places as well, churning up the verges and impacting the environment for all the wildlife therein as great lengths will be lost, not just small areas suggested in the information leaflet.	Yes	Passing places have been located such that, so far as practicable, they are inter-visible, allowing road users to judge the suitability of the distance ahead for the next available passing places. Notwithstanding, the Outline Construction Traffic Management Plan (TA A5.2) **[EN010162/APP/6.4.5.2]** confirms that prior to construction works commencing, roads to be used for construction will be subject to a condition survey and any remedial measures needed to facilitate the works agreed with the local highway authority and completed.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
				Further interim surveys and post-completion condition surveys will also be conducted and any agreed corrective measures undertaken.
Coal Authority	General	We have reviewed the site location plan provided and can confirm that the site falls within the Coal Authority's defined Development Low Risk Area. On this basis we have no specific comments to make.	No	Noted.
Forestry Commission	General	Thank you for consulting the Forestry Commission on the additions to the development. These changes do not alter our previous response, therefore we have no further comments to make at this time.	No	Noted.
Canal River Trust	General	Having reviewed the submitted amendments, we raise no additional comments.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Environment Agency	General	We have no furthers comments to make in regards to the amendments to the proposed site boundary. Please note that our comments made in our response letter XA/2025/100239/01-L01, dated 19 February 2025, still apply.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. The Applicant makes note of this comment. Applicant responses to comments received from the Environment Agency are captured in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**.
NATS Safeguarding	General	NATS operates no infrastructure within 10km of the proposal. Accordingly it anticipates no impact from the development and has no comments to make on the application.	No	Noted.
Natural England	General	Thank you for consulting Natural England as part of the further targeted consultation for Great North Road Solar and Biodiversity Park. Natural England welcome the additional information and following a review of the specific additions to the PEIR Order	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Limits can confirm that we have no additional comments to provide.		
UK Health Security Agency	General	We have no additional comments to provide at this stage. Note that we have responded to earlier consultations, as listed below, and this response should be read in conjunction with that earlier correspondence.	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. The Applicant makes note of this comment. Applicant responses to comments received from the UK Health Security Agency are captured in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**.
Coal Authority	General	However, in the interest of public safety, it is requested that the Coal Authority's Standing Advice note is drawn to the applicant's attention, where relevant.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Health and Safety Executive	General	Explosives Inspectorate has no comment to make as there are no HSE licenced explosives sites in the vicinity of the proposed development.	No	Noted.
Historic England	General	We note that the amendments proposed and the additional areas within the order limits do not adversely impact on any additional heritage assets other than previously identified with the PEIR consulted upon as part of the prior Section 42 consultation, therefore Historic England do not wish to make any further specific comment at the stage.	No	Noted.
West Lindsey District Council	General	Thank you for identifying West Lindsey District Council as a consultee on the above scheme within the neighbouring Newark and Sherwood District. We do not have any further comments to raise with regards to the outlined changes to the site access at the locations outlined (Moorhouse Road and Weston Road, Ossington Lane & North of	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Applicant responses to comments received from the West Lindsey District Council are captured in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		Norwell) beyond our initial response sent on 20/02/2025 noting the potential Cumulative Impact of the wider GNR Solar & Biodiversity Park upon ongoing projects within West Lindsey District and the wider area.		Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**.
Nottinghamshire Fire & Rescue Service	General	The Fire Authority still ask that its comments to date remain on file. Furthermore it is the understanding of the Fire Authority that the proposed changes within the targeted consultation will not affect the provision of emergency access as referenced in its original response (attached above).	No	The Applicant makes note of this comment. Applicant responses to comments received from the Nottingham Fire & Rescue Service are captured in Appendix 5.1.11: Section 42 Applicant Response Table **[EN010162/APP/5.1.11]**.
GTC	General	Thank you for this, I have overlaid into our system and can confirm GTC do not have any assets within this boundary. If your works boundary is updated, please resubmit a shapefile so I can check again for you.	No	Noted.

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
Health and Safety Executive	General	HSE's Land Use Planning advice is dependent on the location of areas where people may be present within HSE's land-use planning zones. As the project area 'redline' is not within any of HSE's land-use planning zones, under HSE's existing policy for providing land-use planning advice, HSE would not advise against the development. HSE's advice in response to a subsequent planning application may differ should HSE's policy or the scope of the development change by the time the Development Consent Order application is submitted.	No	Noted.
Health and Safety Executive	General	In the PEIR it was not clear if there was consideration of risk assessments arising from the development's vulnerability to major accidents. We would advise this is considered further in line with Advice Note 11 Annex on the Planning Inspectorate's website - Annex G – The Health and Safety Executive taking account of the following: "it may be beneficial for applicants to	Yes	The assessment does not consider the risk to construction workers. These risks would be managed through appropriate Health & Safety legislation via the H&S At Work Act (1974) and in accordance with

Respondent	Theme	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
		undertake a risk assessment as early as possible to satisfy themselves that their design and operation will meet the requirements of relevant health and safety legislation as design of the Proposed Development progresses". Note, that there are no requirements for any risk assessments submitted to and approved by the relevant planning authority to also be considered by HSE.		Construction Design and Management (CDM, 2015) regulations. Risk assessments and further detailed design to take place although potential concerns related to this will not comprise major accidents or disasters.
South Kesteven District Council	General	The above proposal has been considered by this Authority and on the 4th June 2025 it was resolved that this Council has no objections to raise.	No	Noted.

3 SECTION 42 (LANDOWNER SECTION 44) APPLICANT RESPONSE TABLE

Table 3: Section 42 (Landowner Section 44) Applicant Response Table

ID	Comment	Has this been addressed by a change to the Development or the Applicant's evidence?	Applicant response
GNR3_E_012	Respondents support the change of area 1.	No	Noted.
GNR3_E_012	Respondent requests the removal of Description of Interest - in half width of highway including subsoil' in land referencing.	Yes	Wadnall Road is no longer in the Order Limits. As such, the Description of Interest was removed from the Book of Reference **[EN010162/APP/4.3]**.